Review Panel Evaluations of Lead Entity Strategies and Lists

Lead Entity: **Chelan County**

Specificity and Focus of Strategy
1. Species and stocks[1]
The Review Panel will consider: • Does the strategy clearly identify all of the stocks in the WRIA(s) comprising the lead entity area? • Is the status of each stock presented? • Are one or more stocks prioritized for habitat restoration and/or protection actions? • Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities? • Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?
Rating: ____Excellent[2] ____Good **X Fair** ____Poor
Narrative (rationale for rating): *Most of the species of salmonids in the lead entity area are identified along with their ESA listing status.* *Status of all species and stocks is not fully clarified and prioritized. For example, status of non-listed species is not included.* *Listed species are given an implicit prioritization in the goal to achieve delisting, but the primary prioritization method used in this lead entity area is a watershed categorization based on several factors, including presence of listed species.* *Coho are identified as extirpated, but no mention of their reintroduction to the area is provided.* *Ranking criteria are not clearly consistent with priorities.*

---

[1] See *A Guide to Lead Entity Strategy Development*, October 10, 2003, for details.

[2] The strategy clearly identifies all salmonid species stocks in the lead entity area, and the status of each stock; one or more stocks are prioritized; there is a clear and supportable rationale presented to justify the priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

2. *Habitat features and watershed processes*
The Review Panel will consider:
• Does the strategy clearly identify watershed processes (i.e., habitat forming processes) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?
• Does the strategy clearly identify habitat features (i.e., habitat conditions) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?
• Does the strategy prioritize limiting watershed processes?
• Does the strategy prioritize limiting habitat features?
• Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
• Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?

Rating: ____Excellent[3]   __X__Good   ____Fair   ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Habitat features are identified, but watershed processes are inadequately addressed.

The limiting factors are discussed and prioritized to some degree, although not through focused criteria or the application of a model.

More is needed on habitat-forming watershed processes and their linkages to habitat features.

3. *Actions and geographic areas*
The Review Panel will consider:
• Does the strategy clearly identify specific actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed processes?
• Does the strategy prioritize actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed processes?
• Does the strategy identify specific geographic areas associated with prioritized actions?
• Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
• Do the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities?

Rating: __X__Excellent[4]   ____Good   ____Fair   ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The watersheds within the lead entity area are categorized into categories 1 through 5 based on presence of listed species and other factors. Within each watershed, there is a list of specific action in priority order.

---

[3] The strategy clearly identifies limiting habitat features and watershed processes and prioritizes these habitat features and watershed processes for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

[4] In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies and prioritizes specific actions and geographic areas for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

4. Community issues

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify community issues and concerns regarding salmon habitat protection and restoration?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for salmon protection and restoration efforts? For the highest biological priority actions and areas?
- Does the strategy prioritize these actions?
- Does the strategy articulate what community values will be taken into consideration in evaluating and ranking projects?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?
- Does the strategy provide for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists?

Rating: ____Excellent[5] **__X__Good** ____Fair ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Community issues are identified in the strategy (but not the summary), but are not prioritized within or between watersheds.

The outreach process for considering community issues in the identification and prioritization of projects is good.

Additional community support might be possible through strategically targeted outreach actions.

Fit of the Project List to the Strategy

5. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:
- The extent the project list addresses the highest priority action and areas, and
- The extent that those actions and areas benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed processes, and limiting habitat features.

Rating: ____Excellent[6] **__X__Good** ____Fair ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

All projects are highest priority actions.

Only one project is in a category 1 watershed (note – the reason for this was clarified in presentation).

Only one of the projects on the list (the instream flow project) involves a category 1 watershed, even though eight of the 18 watersheds are category 1. All other projects address priorities that are identified for those watersheds.

---

[5] The strategy provides for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists; proposes specific actions for building or maintaining community support for highest biological priority actions and areas; lists community values that will be taken into consideration in project evaluation and ranking; and the project evaluation criteria reflect these priorities and values.

[6] The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

6. Fit of project _ranking_

The Review Panel will consider the extent the rank <u>order</u> of the project list addresses the highest priority:

- Stocks
- Limiting watershed processes
- Limiting habitat features
- Actions
- Geographic areas
- Community interests

Rating: **_X_ Excellent**[7]   ____Good   ____Fair   ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

In terms of geographic areas the order of the list is excellent.

The order of the list is consistent with the level of specificity in the strategy.

Transparency of the ranking process could be improved.

The projects all address stated priorities which are almost all in category 2 watersheds, so the strategy does not present a clear basis for prioritizing among projects.

Summary Narrative:

In general, the focus and specificity of the strategy are fairly good, and the fit of the list is good.

The rank order of the list is consistent with the level of specificity in the strategy (an excellent fit to a somewhat unfocused strategy).

---

[7] The rank <u>order</u> of the entire list of projects fits the priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest priorities identified in the strategy and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy, they are lower in the list.

SRFB 5th Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: **Foster Creek**

Specificity and Focus of Strategy

1. *Species and stocks*[1]

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify all of the stocks in the WRIA(s) comprising the lead entity area?
- Is the status of each stock presented?
- Are one or more stocks prioritized for habitat restoration and/or protection actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?

Rating: ____Excellent[2]   __X__Good   ____Fair   ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Species and their federal listing status are identified, along with a good description of where and when they are found in the watershed.

Species priorities are identified but the explanation of the rationale for those priorities could be clearer.

The ranking criteria do not apply any species prioritization except perhaps in the general scoring of "benefit to salmon."

2. *Habitat features and watershed processes*

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify watershed processes (i.e., habitat forming processes) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?
- Does the strategy clearly identify habitat features (i.e., habitat conditions) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?
- Does the strategy prioritize limiting watershed processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize limiting habitat features?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?

Rating: ____Excellent[3]   ____Good   __X__Fair   ____Poor

---

[1] See *A Guide to Lead Entity Strategy Development*, October 10, 2003, for details.

[2] The strategy clearly identifies all salmonid species stocks in the lead entity area, and the status of each stock; one or more stocks are prioritized; there is a clear and supportable rationale presented to justify the priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

[3] The strategy clearly identifies limiting habitat features and watershed processes and prioritizes these habitat features and watershed processes for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

Narrative (rationale for rating):

There is a very good description of general ecosystem conditions, but it is difficult to tease out what factors are limiting in the watershed.

Specific problems are identified in the studied reaches, but they are not prioritized among themselves and the rationale is not fully clear.

Sediment problems are identified, but not in context of watershed processes linked to salmon or habitat limiting factors.

Limiting factors are not prioritized.

Ranking criteria don't directly reflect species priorities.

3. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify specific actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed processes?
- Does the strategy identify specific geographic areas associated with prioritized actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities?

Rating: ____Excellent[4]   **__X__Good**   ____Fair   ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Actions are identified in general for the entire watershed, but only the most significant ones.

Prioritization within the watershed is very unclear.

4. Community issues

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify community issues and concerns regarding salmon habitat protection and restoration?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for salmon protection and restoration efforts? For the highest biological priority actions and areas?
- Does the strategy prioritize these actions?
- Does the strategy articulate what community values will be taken into consideration in evaluating and ranking projects?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?
- Does the strategy provide for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists?

Rating: ____Excellent[5]   ____Good   **__X__Fair**   ____Poor

---

[4] In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies and prioritizes specific actions and geographic areas for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

[5] The strategy provides for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Outreach is evident but a clear strategy to be able to address highest priority biological needs is lacking.

To build and maintain stronger community support, it would help to take specific steps to address areas where there might not be full support at this time.

Fit of the Project List to the Strategy

5. *Actions and geographic areas*

The Review Panel will consider:
- The extent the project list addresses the highest priority action and areas, and
- The extent that those actions and areas benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed processes, and limiting habitat features.

Rating: ____Excellent[6]   ____Good   **X Fair**   ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The single project addresses an identified high priority issue (sediment), but it's unclear if it addresses the highest priority action or area.

6. *Fit of project <u>ranking</u>*

The Review Panel will consider the extent the rank <u>order</u> of the project list addresses the highest priority:
- Stocks
- Limiting watershed processes
- Limiting habitat features
- Actions
- Geographic areas
- Community interests

Rating: ____Excellent[7]   ____Good   ____Fair   ____Poor   **Not Applicable**

Narrative (rationale for rating):

NOTE – There is only one project on this list, limiting the value of this rating.

Summary Narrative:

In general, the focus and specificity of the strategy are fairly good, and the fit of the list is fair.

---

these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists; proposes specific actions for building or maintaining community support for highest biological priority actions and areas; lists community values that will be taken into consideration in project evaluation and ranking; and the project evaluation criteria reflect these priorities and values.

[6] The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

[7] The rank <u>order</u> of the entire list of projects fits the priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest priorities identified in the strategy and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy, they are lower in the list.

SRFB 5th Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: **Grays Harbor County**

Specificity and Focus of Strategy
1. Species and stocks[1]
The Review Panel will consider: • Does the strategy clearly identify all of the stocks in the WRIA(s) comprising the lead entity area? • Is the status of each stock presented? • Are one or more stocks prioritized for habitat restoration and/or protection actions? • Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities? • Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?
Rating: ____Excellent[2]   **X Good**   ____Fair   ____Poor
Narrative (rationale for rating): *The stocks are clearly listed with their SaSI status, and bull trout are identified as threatened under the ESA. Depressed stocks are chosen as a priority. Stock status is a criterion for project evaluation, but the linkage to the strategic selection of stocks could be stronger.*
2. Habitat features and watershed processes
The Review Panel will consider: • Does the strategy clearly identify watershed processes (i.e., habitat forming processes) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks? • Does the strategy clearly identify habitat features (i.e., habitat conditions) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks? • Does the strategy prioritize limiting watershed processes? • Does the strategy prioritize limiting habitat features? • Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities? • Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?
Rating: ____Excellent[3]   ____Good   **X Fair**   ____Poor
Narrative (rationale for rating): *The strategy stresses limiting factors but is weak regarding watershed processes and linkages between processes and habitat features.* *The strategy relies on the limiting factors report to develop priority basins and actions. The emphasis is more on habitat features than on watershed processes.* *While the limiting factors are identified for each subwatershed, more could be done to prioritize them so that sponsors would be guided to the most important projects first.*

---

[1] See *A Guide to Lead Entity Strategy Development*, October 10, 2003, for details.

[2] The strategy clearly identifies all salmonid species stocks in the lead entity area, and the status of each stock; one or more stocks are prioritized; there is a clear and supportable rationale presented to justify the priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

[3] The strategy clearly identifies limiting habitat features and watershed processes and prioritizes these habitat features and watershed processes for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

3. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify specific actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed processes?
- Does the strategy identify specific geographic areas associated with prioritized actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities?

Rating: ____Excellent[4]   **_X_ Good**   ____Fair   ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Subwatersheds are prioritized through a clear and well-presented process, although it would be improved if the TAG were able to evaluate the subwatersheds using some of their other more meaningful watershed level criteria.

The work plan (Appendix B - actions) presents generalized strategies for dealing with what they consider the most pressing limiting factors. For each subwatershed, there is a list of projects that are prioritized.

The ranking criteria are consistent with the work plan.

4. Community issues

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify community issues and concerns regarding salmon habitat protection and restoration?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for salmon protection and restoration efforts? For the highest biological priority actions and areas?
- Does the strategy prioritize these actions?
- Does the strategy articulate what community values will be taken into consideration in evaluating and ranking projects?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?
- Does the strategy provide for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists?

Rating: ____Excellent[5]   **_X_ Good**   **_X_ Fair**   ____Poor

---

[4] In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies and prioritizes specific actions and geographic areas for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

[5] The strategy provides for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists; proposes specific actions for building or maintaining community support for highest biological priority actions and areas; lists community values that will be taken into consideration in project evaluation and ranking; and the project evaluation criteria reflect these priorities and values.

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Good, but more could be done to proactively build support for priority actions/areas of highest biological priority.

The plan to implement a more detailed outreach plan will help bolster community support.

The existing plan could use milestones or short-term goals to provide focus.

Fit of the Project List to the Strategy

5. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:
- The extent the project list addresses the highest priority action and areas, and
- The extent that those actions and areas benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed processes, and limiting habitat features.

Rating: ____Excellent[6] ____Good __X__Fair ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Some projects are not in highest priority areas.

Only 4 (fewer than half) of the projects benefit the identified top priority species. Two of the projects are in low priority subwatersheds, and they are considered exceptions to the standard criteria. While the projects clearly will have benefits to salmon, they do not fit well within the current strategy. Part of the challenge might be that the current subwatershed prioritization method uses miles of habitat, which is as much an artifact of the way they drew subwatershed boundaries. Thus, projects in small subwatersheds are at a disadvantage, even if they open up a lot of habitat. The Anderson Road culvert project is on private property. It benefits coho, cutthroat and steelhead.

[Note – the 10-15-04 draft narrative report erroneously indicated that this rating was "good," but it was correctly depicted as "fair" in Table 1 of that report; is correctly shown here.]

6. Fit of project ranking

The Review Panel will consider the extent the rank order of the project list addresses the highest priority:
- Stocks
- Limiting watershed processes
- Limiting habitat features
- Actions
- Geographic areas
- Community interests

Rating: ____Excellent[7] __X__Good ____Fair ____Poor

---

[6] The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

[7] The rank order of the entire list of projects fits the priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest priorities identified in the strategy and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy, they are lower in the list.

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The broad geographic priorities and latitude in the ranking criteria provide a lot of latitude in ranking projects. The criteria and the strategy are not closely aligned, and projects on the list do not closely align with the strategy.
However, the projects are ranked appropriately in relation to the criteria provided.

It is clear to the RP how project #2 was ranked based on the criteria; however, as noted above the ranking criteria are not tightly bound to the priorities in the strategy, therefore leaving some ambiguity in the actual rank of the project.

Summary Narrative:

In general, focus and specificity of the strategy are fair and fit of the list is fairly good.

SRFB 5th Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: Hood Canal Coordinating Council

Specificity and Focus of Strategy

1. Species and stocks[1]

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify all of the stocks in the WRIA(s) comprising the lead entity area?
- Is the status of each stock presented?
- Are one or more stocks prioritized for habitat restoration and/or protection actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?

Rating: __X__ **Excellent**[2] ____Good ____Fair ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The strategy presents ESA listing and SaSI status by subwatershed.

Additional status information would be helpful, and it isn't clear if all salmonids in the area are identified.

The strategy clearly prioritizes stocks listed under the ESA over other salmonids.

2. Habitat features and watershed processes

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify watershed processes (i.e., habitat forming processes) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?
- Does the strategy clearly identify habitat features (i.e., habitat conditions) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?
- Does the strategy prioritize limiting watershed processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize limiting habitat features?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?

Rating: ____Excellent[3] __X__ **Good** ____Fair ____Poor

---

[1] See *A Guide to Lead Entity Strategy Development*, October 10, 2003, for details.

[2] The strategy clearly identifies all salmonid species stocks in the lead entity area, and the status of each stock; one or more stocks are prioritized; there is a clear and supportable rationale presented to justify the priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

[3] The strategy clearly identifies limiting habitat features and watershed processes and prioritizes these habitat features and watershed processes for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Good, but information on watershed processes was not clearly folded in.

The strategy relies on limiting factors information from other documents.

Rather than expecting project sponsors to read and understand all limiting factors information, the strategy provides a list of pre-screened project ideas that are consistent with the limiting factors. The RP feels this is a good practical approach even though it does not fully comport with the SRFB's "excellent" definition.

3. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify specific actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed processes?
- Does the strategy identify specific geographic areas associated with prioritized actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities?

Rating: __X__**Excellent**[4] ____Good ____Fair ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Clearly identifies and prioritizes actions and areas, and the rationale is clearly described.

Noteworthy is that specific lists of priority projects were identified for each subwatershed. This provides a very valuable tool to direct attention to the highest priority actions in the highest priority areas.

The approach to prioritizing nearshore areas is a great step forward compared to saying the entire nearshore is (equally) important.

4. Community issues

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify community issues and concerns regarding salmon habitat protection and restoration?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for salmon protection and restoration efforts? For the highest biological priority actions and areas?
- Does the strategy prioritize these actions?
- Does the strategy articulate what community values will be taken into consideration in evaluating and ranking projects?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?
- Does the strategy provide for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists?

Rating: ____Excellent[5] __X__**Good** ____Fair ____Poor

---

[4] In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies and prioritizes specific actions and geographic areas for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Good outreach process for support building; however, no prioritization or strategic approach is described to address the highest unmet biological priorities.

The community issues are addressed in advance of and during project development, and again explicitly in the project ranking process.

The strategy refers to actions and programs underway to improve community support, and additional information would be needed to know if they are prioritized or directed at improving support for specific high priority actions that currently lack support.

Fit of the Project List to the Strategy

5. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:
- The extent the project list addresses the highest priority action and areas, and
- The extent that those actions and areas benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed processes, and limiting habitat features.

Rating: ____Excellent[6]   __X__Good   ____Fair   ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

All top projects are in highest priority areas and address documented limiting factors, but some projects on the list are not in the highest priority areas.

6. Fit of project <u>ranking</u>

The Review Panel will consider the extent the rank <u>order</u> of the project list addresses the highest priority:
- Stocks
- Limiting watershed processes
- Limiting habitat features
- Actions
- Geographic areas
- Community interests

Rating: __X__Excellent[7]   ____Good   ____Fair   ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Rank order is consistent with the strategy.

---

[5] The strategy provides for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists; proposes specific actions for building or maintaining community support for highest biological priority actions and areas; lists community values that will be taken into consideration in project evaluation and ranking; and the project evaluation criteria reflect these priorities and values.

[6] The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

[7] The rank <u>order</u> of the entire list of projects fits the priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest priorities identified in the strategy and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy, they are lower in the list.

Summary Narrative:

In general, the strategy is well focused and specific, and fit of the list is good.

The rank order of the list is consistent with the level of specificity in the strategy (an excellent fit to a fairly well focused strategy).

RP recognizes the high degree of complexity and effort required across this diverse lead entity area.

SRFB 5th Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: Island County

Specificity and Focus of Strategy

1. Species and stocks[1]

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify all of the stocks in the WRIA(s) comprising the lead entity area?
- Is the status of each stock presented?
- Are one or more stocks prioritized for habitat restoration and/or protection actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?

Rating: ____Excellent[2] **__X__Good** ____Fair ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The strategy does a good job of identifying the stocks that pass through the WRIA, but it does not clearly present the status of <u>all</u> of those stocks.

A group of the Chinook stocks is identified as top priority. However, this is not reflected in the ranking criteria.

2. Habitat features and watershed processes

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify watershed processes (i.e., habitat forming processes) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?
- Does the strategy clearly identify habitat features (i.e., habitat conditions) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?
- Does the strategy prioritize limiting watershed processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize limiting habitat features?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?

Rating: ____Excellent[3] **__X__Good** ____Fair ____Poor

---

[1] See *A Guide to Lead Entity Strategy Development*, October 10, 2003, for details.

[2] The strategy clearly identifies all salmonid species stocks in the lead entity area, and the status of each stock; one or more stocks are prioritized; there is a clear and supportable rationale presented to justify the priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

[3] The strategy clearly identifies limiting habitat features and watershed processes and prioritizes these habitat features and watershed processes for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Good general discussion of priorities is included, but could be more specific.

The strategy doesn't document how habitat features are limiting. It also focuses on habitat features in the watersheds and nearshore, and could be enhanced by addressing habitat-forming processes.

The strategy addresses habitat degradation and conditions in Island County streams and nearshore areas.

As is the case with other nearshore-oriented strategies, the strategy has not yet reached the point where the relative benefit of projects in the nearshore can be compared to projects in freshwater areas that have been analyzed in a consistent manner (e.g., a life cycle model).

In order to have clear support for actions intended to benefit salmon populations in nearshore areas, some estimate of the benefit of those actions and areas relative to freshwater habitats would be useful.

3. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify specific actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed processes?
- Does the strategy identify specific geographic areas associated with prioritized actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities?

Rating: _____Excellent[4]   __X__Good   _____Fair   _____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Priorities are clearly identified and supported.

Actions are not prioritized as clearly as needed.

Ranking doesn't support the priorities.

The strategy prioritizes protection over restoration, but the ranking criteria do exactly the opposite: projects can get 5 or 4 points on the first criterion for showing a net increase in habitat, but only a maximum of 3 points for protection habitat.

The strategy prioritizes the Whidbey Basin over Admiralty Inlet, consistent with the prioritization of stocks.

The strategy mentions priorities, and it would be even clearer if the specific actions (such as those listed in Table 12) were prioritized.

---

[4] In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies and prioritizes specific actions and geographic areas for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

4. Community issues

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify community issues and concerns regarding salmon habitat protection and restoration?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for salmon protection and restoration efforts? For the highest biological priority actions and areas?
- Does the strategy prioritize these actions?
- Does the strategy articulate what community values will be taken into consideration in evaluating and ranking projects?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?
- Does the strategy provide for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists?

Rating: ____Excellent[5]   ____Good   ____Fair   __X__Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Community issues and concerns are identified, and they are *addressed on a case-by-case basis.*

The strategy contains no community interests strategy, and contains no priorities.

Island County uses a case-by-case approach for identifying and addressing community issues.

A more proactive approach could be developed to provide even greater guidance to potential project sponsors about what projects are likely to be supported.

Actions are not identified or prioritized to build community support, even in the areas where community concerns have been identified.

Fit of the Project List to the Strategy

5. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:
- The extent the project list addresses the highest priority action and areas, and
- The extent that those actions and areas benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed processes, and limiting habitat features.

Rating: ____Excellent[6]   ____Good   __X__Fair   ____Poor

---

[5] The strategy provides for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists; proposes specific actions for building or maintaining community support for highest biological priority actions and areas; lists community values that will be taken into consideration in project evaluation and ranking; and the project evaluation criteria reflect these priorities and values.

[6] The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The strategy prioritizes protection over restoration for several reasons.

The project list includes a restoration project and an assessment.

One project on the list is in a priority area whereas the other project is not in the highest priority area and is an assessment.

---

6. Fit of project <u>ranking</u>

The Review Panel will consider the extent the rank <u>order</u> of the project list addresses the highest priority:

- Stocks
- Limiting watershed processes
- Limiting habitat features
- Actions
- Geographic areas
- Community interests

Rating: __X__**Excellent**[7]   ____Good   ____Fair   ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Note – there are only two projects on this list, limiting the value of this rating.

Summary Narrative:

In general, the focus and specificity or the strategy, and fit of the list are fair.

The rank order of the list is consistent with the level of specificity in the strategy (an excellent fit to a fairly unfocused strategy).

Lead entity emphasized that their strategy is in flux, and will change.

Kudos to the lead entity for their candid and direct self-appraisal as reflected in their presentation material.

---

[7] The rank <u>order</u> of the entire list of projects fits the priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest priorities identified in the strategy and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy, they are lower in the list.

SRFB 5th Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: **King County WRIA 8**

Specificity and Focus of Strategy

1. *Species and stocks*[1]

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify all of the stocks in the WRIA(s) comprising the lead entity area?
- Is the status of each stock presented?
- Are one or more stocks prioritized for habitat restoration and/or protection actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?

Rating: ____Excellent[2]   __X__Good   ____Fair   ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The strategy focuses exclusively on Chinook salmon as the priority species.

The strategy summary includes the listing status of Chinook salmon and the other salmon populations in the area, but very little information about stock status.

Listed Chinook salmon and bull trout are identified as priorities in the strategy summary, but bull trout are not discussed in the strategy.

The rationale for not including bull trout (and coho as was mentioned in the presentation) is unstated.

Only Chinook salmon appears to be given extra credit in the criteria.

2. *Habitat features and watershed processes*

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify watershed processes (i.e., habitat forming processes) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?
- Does the strategy clearly identify habitat features (i.e., habitat conditions) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?
- Does the strategy prioritize limiting watershed processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize limiting habitat features?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?

Rating: __X__Excellent[3]   ____Good   ____Fair   ____Poor

---

[1] See *A Guide to Lead Entity Strategy Development*, October 10, 2003, for details.

[2] The strategy clearly identifies all salmonid species stocks in the lead entity area, and the status of each stock; one or more stocks are prioritized; there is a clear and supportable rationale presented to justify the priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

[3] The strategy clearly identifies limiting habitat features and watershed processes and prioritizes these habitat features and watershed processes for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The strategy is comprehensive but could be more clearly articulated..

The strategy could go farther in prioritizing within identified habitat features and within watershed processes.

The assessment work done in this watershed is significant. It identifies a number of habitat features and some watershed processes, and it uses EDT as a tool to identify the ones that appear to offer the greatest opportunities for protection and restoration in each subarea.

This approach seems to bypass the identification of which factors are limiting and which are the highest priority, and instead looks at where future actions will make the greatest difference
.

---

3. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify specific actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed processes?
- Does the strategy identify specific geographic areas associated with prioritized actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities?

Rating: __X__ **Excellent**[4]   ____Good   ____Fair   ____Poor

---

Prioritization of geographic areas is excellent.

Prioritization of actions is weak.

Actions and areas are prioritized in the summary but are not clearly articulated in the strategy.

The strategy lists the highest priority areas and the highest priority categories of actions within each area.

Although the strategy prioritizes geographic areas, it could be more focused if it did not treat every area used by the core populations as equally important.

Additional effort to distinguish which migratory corridors (i.e., lake subareas) may be most limiting would be useful.

---

[4] In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies and prioritizes specific actions and geographic areas for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

4. Community issues

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify community issues and concerns regarding salmon habitat protection and restoration?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for salmon protection and restoration efforts? For the highest biological priority actions and areas?
- Does the strategy prioritize these actions?
- Does the strategy articulate what community values will be taken into consideration in evaluating and ranking projects?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?
- Does the strategy provide for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists?

Rating: ____Excellent[5]   **X Good**   ____Fair   ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Excellent if based on summary and presentation, but RP was unable to find supportive documentation in the strategy needed to achieve excellent rating.

Tailoring to each high priority sub-area is excellent.

The strategy lists outreach and education activities to build community support, although they are not prioritized and it is not clear that they are targeted toward increasing community support for the specific actions that are the highest biological priorities.

Fit of the Project List to the Strategy

5. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:
- The extent the project list addresses the highest priority action and areas, and
- The extent that those actions and areas benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed processes, and limiting habitat features.

Rating: **X Excellent**[6]   ____Good   ____Fair   ____Poor

---

[5] The strategy provides for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists; proposes specific actions for building or maintaining community support for highest biological priority actions and areas; lists community values that will be taken into consideration in project evaluation and ranking; and the project evaluation criteria reflect these priorities and values.

[6] The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

Narrative (rationale for rating):

All of the projects address the identified priority species (Chinook salmon).

Three of the 5 projects are on the Cedar, the highest priority area identified by the lead entity, and the other two are in high priority areas for Chinook that spawn in other parts of the WRIA.

The list of projects appears to balance protection and restoration consistent with the strategy, and to address high priority issues in each area, but it is not entirely clear that they are addressing the highest priority habitat or watershed process issues.

---

6. Fit of project *ranking*

The Review Panel will consider the extent the rank <u>order</u> of the project list addresses the highest priority:
- Stocks
- Limiting watershed processes
- Limiting habitat features
- Actions
- Geographic areas
- Community interests

Rating: **___X___Excellent**[7]   ____Good   ____Fair   ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Rank order is consistent with strategy.

The description of how the rank order of the projects addresses the top priority populations first and the top priority reaches for each population is clear.

Summary Narrative:

In general, the focus and specificity of the strategy are very good, and the fit of the list is excellent.

The rank order of the list is consistent with the level of specificity in the strategy (an excellent fit to a fairly well focused strategy).

---

[7] The rank <u>order</u> of the entire list of projects fits the priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest priorities identified in the strategy and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy, they are lower in the list.

SRFB 5th Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: **King County WRIA 9**

Specificity and Focus of Strategy

1. Species and stocks[1]

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify all of the stocks in the WRIA(s) comprising the lead entity area?
- Is the status of each stock presented?
- Are one or more stocks prioritized for habitat restoration and/or protection actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?

Rating: ____Excellent[2] **__X__Good** ____Fair ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

In the strategy and strategy summary, all stocks are identified but the status of <u>all</u> is not.

Priorities are identified but the clarity of the rationale could be improved.

Priorities seem to be inconsistently applied throughout the strategy, and were not consistent with ranking criteria.

The prioritization is not entirely clear and consistent across documents.

2. Habitat features and watershed processes

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify watershed processes (i.e., habitat forming processes) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?
- Does the strategy clearly identify habitat features (i.e., habitat conditions) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?
- Does the strategy prioritize limiting watershed processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize limiting habitat features?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?

Rating: **__X_Excellent[3]** ____Good ____Fair ____Poor

---

[1] See *A Guide to Lead Entity Strategy Development*, October 10, 2003, for details.

[2] The strategy clearly identifies all salmonid species stocks in the lead entity area, and the status of each stock; one or more stocks are prioritized; there is a clear and supportable rationale presented to justify the priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

[3] The strategy clearly identifies limiting habitat features and watershed processes and prioritizes these habitat features and watershed processes for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Habitat features and watershed processes are generally well identified and prioritized, (with the exception of nearshore).

The matrix is an especially clear and useful tool (but the strategy summary and strategy are less clear).

The limiting factors work identifies habitat issues but does not clearly prioritize them.

Strives for an ecosystem, multi-species approach, addressing VSP criteria for Chinook salmon. Both are valuable, but the result is that anything that benefits juvenile survival is a priority.

Although rated as excellent, additional focus could help guide future project sponsors to more strategic priorities.

3. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify specific actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed processes?
- Does the strategy identify specific geographic areas associated with prioritized actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities?

Rating: ____Excellent[4]   **_X_Good**   ____Fair   ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Strategy uses a good approach through use of reaches (e.g., as in the matrix), but lacks specificity.

The RP recognizes the lead entity is in the process of prioritizing areas and actions. The initial priority areas are a good start, although they still cover very large areas (i.e., the entire mainstem and all nearshore areas).

---

[4] In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies and prioritizes specific actions and geographic areas for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

4. Community issues

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify community issues and concerns regarding salmon habitat protection and restoration?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for salmon protection and restoration efforts? For the highest biological priority actions and areas?
- Does the strategy prioritize these actions?
- Does the strategy articulate what community values will be taken into consideration in evaluating and ranking projects?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?
- Does the strategy provide for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists?

Rating: ____Excellent[5] **__X__Good** ___Fair ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

General outreach and public participation exists but could be better described.

The strategy contains a community goal but could be clearer and more strategic at addressing community needs related to the highest priority unmet biological needs.

The rationale for the intended balance between freshwater and nearshore is not fully transparent.

The strategy and strategy summary focus on the community issues as they pertain to support for submitted projects.

The public education and outreach plan is mentioned, but more detail would be needed to know if it is focused on increasing support for top priorities.

The description of how the previous bulkhead removal project builds support for needed high priority bulkhead removal was helpful.

Fit of the Project List to the Strategy

5. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:
- The extent the project list addresses the highest priority action and areas, and
- The extent that those actions and areas benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed processes, and limiting habitat features.

Rating: ____Excellent[6] **__X_Good** ____Fair ____Poor

---

[5] The strategy provides for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists; proposes specific actions for building or maintaining community support for highest biological priority actions and areas; lists community values that will be taken into consideration in project evaluation and ranking; and the project evaluation criteria reflect these priorities and values.

[6] The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Although all projects are in identified high priority areas targeting specified actions (but all areas are equally high and not prioritized), the extent of the benefit to priority species and limiting habitat features is questionable.

It is not clear that the balance of two freshwater and three nearshore projects on the list is consistent with the strategy. (This may be an artifact of sponsor responses that resulted in this year's list.)

The strategy emphasizes projects in the mainstem Green/Duwamish, the lower reach of Newaukum Creek, and the nearshore.

It is not entirely clear that the amount of investment (reflected by the list) in the nearshore is consistent with the strategy, or the extent to which nearshore habitat improvements will address the highest priorities for recovery.

6. Fit of project ranking

The Review Panel will consider the extent the rank order of the project list addresses the highest priority:
- Stocks
- Limiting watershed processes
- Limiting habitat features
- Actions
- Geographic areas
- Community interests

Rating: __**X_Excellent**[7]   ____Good   ____Fair   ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Projects most inconsistent with the strategy are at the bottom of the list.

Summary Narrative:

In general, the focus and specificity of the strategy, and the fit of the list are good.

The rank order of the list is consistent with the level of specificity in the strategy (an excellent fit to a somewhat unfocused strategy).

---

[7] The rank order of the entire list of projects fits the priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest priorities identified in the strategy and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy, they are lower in the list.

SRFB 5th Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: Kitsap County

Specificity and Focus of Strategy

1. Species and stocks[1]

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify all of the stocks in the WRIA(s) comprising the lead entity area?
- Is the status of each stock presented?
- Are one or more stocks prioritized for habitat restoration and/or protection actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?

Rating: ____Excellent[2] __X_Good ____Fair ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Information consistent with rating criteria on <u>all</u> species and their status is not in the final strategy document, but is in the summary provided with the lead entity submittal (e.g., in the form of a simple table of stocks and status in the LE area).

In context of the lead entity's multispecies approach, stocks are not prioritized, and there are gaps in the status information provided.

2. Habitat features and watershed processes

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify watershed processes (i.e., habitat forming processes) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?
- Does the strategy clearly identify habitat features (i.e., habitat conditions) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?
- Does the strategy prioritize limiting watershed processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize limiting habitat features?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?

Rating: ____Excellent[3] __X__Good ____Fair ____Poor

---

[1] See *A Guide to Lead Entity Strategy Development*, October 10, 2003, for details.

[2] The strategy clearly identifies all salmonid species stocks in the lead entity area, and the status of each stock; one or more stocks are prioritized; there is a clear and supportable rationale presented to justify the priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

[3] The strategy clearly identifies limiting habitat features and watershed processes and prioritizes these habitat features and watershed processes for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The limiting factors analysis was cited as a very fundamental information source, but was not provided to or reviewed by RP (until the final presentation), thus hampering demonstration of its influence.

Emphasis on the limiting factors analysis well addresses limiting habitat features (local habitat conditions) but not watershed processes (causes of those local habitat conditions).

Clarification or examples that better describe alignment and linkages between habitat features, watershed processes, and priorities would be helpful.

The summary describes stressors, and relies on the limiting factors analysis report for limiting factors, which are not prioritized. The strategy summary takes a very positive step toward identifying important nearshore limiting factors.

---

3. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify specific actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed processes?
- Does the strategy identify specific geographic areas associated with prioritized actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities?

Rating: ____Excellent[4]   **_X_Good**   ____Fair   ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Watersheds are prioritized based on salmon populations, habitat quality and watershed size.

Rather than actions, the strategy summary describes objectives based on the limiting factors.

Appendix E in the strategy identifies and prioritizes actions.

All nearshore is Tier 1 high priority. Treating the entire nearshore as a high priority is no more useful than a watershed that treats the entire watershed as a high priority. Specificity needs to be improved.

More recent characterization of nearshore conditions in part of the lead entity area has led to a very clear and specific list of actions found in Appendix B. The lead entity has not yet used this information to prioritize project possibilities and it is not included in the current strategy. (But they intend to in future iterations of their strategy.)

---

[4] In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies and prioritizes specific actions and geographic areas for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

4. Community issues

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify community issues and concerns regarding salmon habitat protection and restoration?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for salmon protection and restoration efforts? For the highest biological priority actions and areas?
- Does the strategy prioritize these actions?
- Does the strategy articulate what community values will be taken into consideration in evaluating and ranking projects?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?
- Does the strategy provide for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists?

| **Rating:** | ____Excellent[5] | ____Good | **__X_Fair** | ____Poor |

Narrative (rationale for rating):

A high level of outreach effort is noted but a strategic approach to address the most important priority biological issues was not evident. The overall approach seems to be aimed at achieving general (not necessarily focused) support for the highest biological priority restoration and protection needs.

Projects can appropriately rank higher if they include more of a community support element, but the strategy does not go as far as identifying community issues and concerns related to highest biological priorities, or proposing and prioritizing actions to address them.

Fit of the Project List to the Strategy

5. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:
- The extent the project list addresses the highest priority action and areas, and
- The extent that those actions and areas benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed processes, and limiting habitat features.

| **Rating:** | ____Excellent[6] | **__X_Good** | ____Fair | ____Poor |

---

[5] The strategy provides for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists; proposes specific actions for building or maintaining community support for highest biological priority actions and areas; lists community values that will be taken into consideration in project evaluation and ranking; and the project evaluation criteria reflect these priorities and values.

[6] The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Not all projects (one) are in the high<u>est</u> geographic area (Tier 1), that was needed to achieve an excellent rating.

The projects address priorities in the strategy and strategy summary, but the extent to which some of them address issues in the nearshore is very unclear.

The number one ranked project is a nearshore assessment that sounds more like a local government planning exercise to identify critical areas for protection, than an assessment that would lead directly to projects. [note – this is a general observation only, and had no impact on the rating.]

Since the assessment relates to an identified data gap in the strategy, the project is consistent with the strategy.

---

6. Fit of project <u>ranking</u>

The Review Panel will consider the extent the rank <u>order</u> of the project list addresses the highest priority:
- Stocks
- Limiting watershed processes
- Limiting habitat features
- Actions
- Geographic areas
- Community interests

Rating: ____Excellent[7]   **_X_ Good**   ____Fair   ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Protection of nearshore areas is the highest stated priority in the strategy.

Both projects 1 and 3 are nearshore projects, but project 3 is a protection project while project 1 is a continuation of the nearshore assessment. These projects appear to be out of alignment with the strategy (lower and higher in the strategy, respectively). The ranking criteria associated with fit to strategy rated project 1 as Med/High and Project 3 as High. In addition, project 2 is a restoration project with a lower certainty of success rating than project 3.

Although the ranking process appropriately gives final ranking discretion to the CAG and allows the CAG to move rank of projects based on a consensus decision, the rationale for these decisions is not clearly presented.

---

[7] The rank <u>order</u> of the entire list of projects fits the priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest priorities identified in the strategy and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy, they are lower in the list.

Summary Narrative:

In general, the focus and specificity of the strategy are fairly good, and the fit of the list is good.

SRFB 5th Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: **Klickitat County**

Specificity and Focus of Strategy
1. Species and stocks[1]
The Review Panel will consider: • Does the strategy clearly identify all of the stocks in the WRIA(s) comprising the lead entity area? • Is the status of each stock presented? • Are one or more stocks prioritized for habitat restoration and/or protection actions? • Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities? • Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?
Rating: ___**X_Excellent**[2] ____Good ____Fair ____Poor
Narrative (rationale for rating): *The strategy identifies species and stocks.* *The clarity of the prioritization rationale is among the best in the state.* *Species/stock priorities are consistent with ranking criteria.*
2. Habitat features and watershed processes
The Review Panel will consider: • Does the strategy clearly identify watershed processes (i.e., habitat forming processes) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks? • Does the strategy clearly identify habitat features (i.e., habitat conditions) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks? • Does the strategy prioritize limiting watershed processes? • Does the strategy prioritize limiting habitat features? • Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities? • Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?
Rating: ____Excellent[3] __**X_Good** ____Fair ____Poor

---

[1] See *A Guide to Lead Entity Strategy Development*, October 10, 2003, for details.

[2] The strategy clearly identifies all salmonid species stocks in the lead entity area, and the status of each stock; one or more stocks are prioritized; there is a clear and supportable rationale presented to justify the priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

[3] The strategy clearly identifies limiting habitat features and watershed processes and prioritizes these habitat features and watershed processes for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Habitat features are identified and prioritized in the strategy.

Limiting factors include some watershed processes as well as habitat features, but there is little discussion of the linkages between the two.

The strategy makes excellent progress toward identifying and prioritizing watershed processes, though where attempted, the approach makes conceptual, not empirical linkages to habitat features.

The matrix is clear and useful.

3. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify specific actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed processes?
- Does the strategy identify specific geographic areas associated with prioritized actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities?

Rating: __X_Excellent[4] ____Good ____Fair ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The strategy concisely identifies actions and areas and prioritizes them.

The strategy very clearly identifies and prioritizes geographic areas and the rationale is clear.

The types of actions are listed which may evolve into more specific actions and priorities in the future.

4. Community issues

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify community issues and concerns regarding salmon habitat protection and restoration?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for salmon protection and restoration efforts? For the highest biological priority actions and areas?
- Does the strategy prioritize these actions?
- Does the strategy articulate what community values will be taken into consideration in evaluating and ranking projects?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?
- Does the strategy provide for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists?

Rating: __X_Excellent[5] ____Good ____Fair ____Poor

---

[4] In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies and prioritizes specific actions and geographic areas for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

Narrative (rationale for rating):

NOTE – This is the only strategy reviewed by the RP that identified and described community issues and limitations, as well as a systematic approach to address them.

The strategy doesn't prioritize the community issue limitations, but doing so would be an improvement.

The strategy explicitly identifies project-specific linkages.

The lists of community values that support or limit particular types of projects are very valuable.

Community values (both support and limitations addressed) are included in the evaluation criteria and ranking process.

Fit of the Project List to the Strategy

5. *Actions and geographic areas*

The Review Panel will consider:
- The extent the project list addresses the highest priority action and areas, and
- The extent that those actions and areas benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed processes, and limiting habitat features.

Rating: ____Excellent[6]   **__X_Good**   ____Fair   ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

All projects are not in highest priority area.

Three of the four projects address top priorities, and the remaining one is in a lower-ranked area, but it carries out the top priority in that area.

6. *Fit of project ranking*

The Review Panel will consider the extent the rank order of the project list addresses the highest priority:
- Stocks
- Limiting watershed processes
- Limiting habitat features
- Actions
- Geographic areas
- Community interests

Rating: ____Excellent[7]   **__X_Good**   ____Fair   ____Poor

---

[5] The strategy provides for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists; proposes specific actions for building or maintaining community support for highest biological priority actions and areas; lists community values that will be taken into consideration in project evaluation and ranking; and the project evaluation criteria reflect these priorities and values.

[6] The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

[7] The rank order of the entire list of projects fits the priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest priorities identified in the strategy and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy, they are lower in the list.

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The rationale for the order of projects on the list is not fully transparent.

The Snyder Creek project is in a lower priority area than projects that rank in the top priority area. Reasons for this (i.e., community support through citizen's committee) were clarified in the presentation.

Summary Narrative:

In general, the focus and specificity of the strategy are excellent, and the fit of the list is good.

SRFB 5th Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: **Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board**

Specificity and Focus of Strategy
1. Species and stocks[1]
The Review Panel will consider: • Does the strategy clearly identify all of the stocks in the WRIA(s) comprising the lead entity area? • Is the status of each stock presented? • Are one or more stocks prioritized for habitat restoration and/or protection actions? • Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities? • Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?
Rating: __**X_Excellent**[2] ____Good ____Fair ____Poor
Narrative (rationale for rating): *The strategy uses a complex but very rational approach, given large and diverse area.* *Stocks and their status by watershed within the region are clearly presented. The strategy summary does not describe the prioritization process for species, and the strategy itself was not included in the new materials reviewed, but it does identify the primary, contributing, and supporting watersheds for the various species.*
2. Habitat features and watershed processes
The Review Panel will consider: • Does the strategy clearly identify watershed processes (i.e., habitat forming processes) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks? • Does the strategy clearly identify habitat features (i.e., habitat conditions) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks? • Does the strategy prioritize limiting watershed processes? • Does the strategy prioritize limiting habitat features? • Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities? • Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?
Rating: ____Excellent[3] __**X_Good** ____Fair ____Poor

---

[1] See *A Guide to Lead Entity Strategy Development*, October 10, 2003, for details.

[2] The strategy clearly identifies all salmonid species stocks in the lead entity area, and the status of each stock; one or more stocks are prioritized; there is a clear and supportable rationale presented to justify the priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

[3] The strategy clearly identifies limiting habitat features and watershed processes and prioritizes these habitat features and watershed processes for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

Note - although watershed processes are not described in the strategy summary, the strategy document is one of the few that provide a context for habitat restoration through a general discussion of watershed processes in the different WRIAs.

The summary of the Integrated Watershed Assessment analysis included in the strategy is intended to characterize processes more completely, even though it and other work don't result in clear priorities at this time.

The linkages and relationships between watershed processes and habitat features are not described with much specificity.

The EDT-based analysis clearly identifies the habitat features that appear to be the most significant opportunities for protection and restoration of the target species in each watershed.

---

3. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify specific actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed processes?
- Does the strategy identify specific geographic areas associated with prioritized actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities?

Rating: ____Excellent[4]   ____Good   **X Fair**   ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The RP recognizes the complexity across the lead entity area and the progress made to date. However, no specific actions were identified or prioritized within the geographic strata (as was acknowledged by the lead entity).

Tiering of geographic areas and priority reaches are clearly identified with a clear rationale based on the populations they support and on EDT respectively, but specific actions are not identified.

---

[4] In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies and prioritizes specific actions and geographic areas for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

4. Community issues

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify community issues and concerns regarding salmon habitat protection and restoration?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for salmon protection and restoration efforts? For the highest biological priority actions and areas?
- Does the strategy prioritize these actions?
- Does the strategy articulate what community values will be taken into consideration in evaluating and ranking projects?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?
- Does the strategy provide for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists?

Rating: ____Excellent[5]   ____Good   **_X_Fair**   ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Strategy includes an excellent outreach process, but more is needed to identify and strategically address community issue needs and proactively seek projects to address highest priority actions/areas.

The strategy builds general support through meetings, individual communications, and through the lead entity process.

Although the strategy summary identifies limitations in sponsor capacity, improvements could involve strengthening identification of community issues in advance and using that to guide prioritization and targeting of future actions, and by developing a strategy to build support from the broader community.

Fit of the Project List to the Strategy

5. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:
- The extent the project list addresses the highest priority action and areas, and
- The extent that those actions and areas benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed processes, and limiting habitat features.

Rating: ____Excellent[6]   **__X_Good**   ____Fair   ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Half of projects are not in highest priority areas.

While the majority of the projects address primary species and/or group A watersheds and/or tier 1 reaches, half of them do not meet all of these criteria.

---

[5] The strategy provides for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists; proposes specific actions for building or maintaining community support for highest biological priority actions and areas; lists community values that will be taken into consideration in project evaluation and ranking; and the project evaluation criteria reflect these priorities and values.

[6] The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

6. Fit of project _ranking_

The Review Panel will consider the extent the rank <u>order</u> of the project list addresses the highest priority:

- Stocks
- Limiting watershed processes
- Limiting habitat features
- Actions
- Geographic areas
- Community interests

Rating: ____Excellent[7]   **__X_Good**   ____Fair   ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The fit of project ranking is good, but some inconsistent alignment exists between order of projects and priority order.

The ranking system orients to identified needs.

Transparency for how the ranking was done is excellent. Some elements of the ranking approach, by design, allow factors that are not addressed in the strategy to come into play.

A couple of project proposals (e.g., Grays River bar and Middle Wind habitat enhancement) got lower scores in some areas (for good reasons) which lowered them on the list relative to the strategic priorities, and at least one proposal (the carcass study) appeared to get a higher score than would be expected from the strategy.

Summary Narrative:

In general, focus and specificity of the strategy are fairly good, and the fit of the list is good.

Greater specificity in the connection of watershed processes and identification of specific actions could focus sponsors attentions in higher priority areas.

The RP recognizes the high level of complexity and effort applied to this very diverse lead entity area.

---

[7] The rank <u>order</u> of the entire list of projects fits the priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest priorities identified in the strategy and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy, they are lower in the list.

SRFB 5th Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: **Mason Conservation District**

Specificity and Focus of Strategy

1. Species and stocks[1]

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify all of the stocks in the WRIA(s) comprising the lead entity area?
- Is the status of each stock presented?
- Are one or more stocks prioritized for habitat restoration and/or protection actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?

Rating: ____Excellent[2]   **_X_Good**   ____Fair   ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Species and stocks are clearly described but not prioritized.

The strategy includes a good description of all the stocks that spawn in the WRIA, as well as stocks that are likely to rear in the area. The official SaSI status of many of the stocks is unknown, and the strategy presents some additional information for them.

2. Habitat features and watershed processes

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify watershed processes (i.e., habitat forming processes) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?
- Does the strategy clearly identify habitat features (i.e., habitat conditions) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?
- Does the strategy prioritize limiting watershed processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize limiting habitat features?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?

Rating: ____Excellent[3]   **_X_Good**   ____Fair   ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Watershed processes and linkages to habitat features are very weakly addressed.

Using the limiting factors analysis sub basin summaries as provided in the strategy lays out a fairly clear linkage between habitat conditions, limiting factors and species.

The most important limiting factors are listed, but are not prioritized.

---

[1] See *A Guide to Lead Entity Strategy Development*, October 10, 2003, for details.

[2] The strategy clearly identifies all salmonid species stocks in the lead entity area, and the status of each stock; one or more stocks are prioritized; there is a clear and supportable rationale presented to justify the priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

[3] The strategy clearly identifies limiting habitat features and watershed processes and prioritizes these habitat features and watershed processes for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

3. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify specific actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed processes?
- Does the strategy identify specific geographic areas associated with prioritized actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities?

Rating: ____Excellent[4] __**X_Good**__ ____Fair ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The strategy does not specifically prioritize actions across areas, but did better within areas.

Consistent with the intent to maintain community support for their work, this lead entity chose not to prioritize geographic areas or specific actions.

The lead entity provides annual guidance to potential project sponsors to avoid a random and opportunistic approach, and the watershed sections of the strategy identify high priority actions.

Actions cover the WRIA and there are so many that it is not clear how useful the lists of actions are for guiding sponsors toward strategic priorities.

4. Community issues

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify community issues and concerns regarding salmon habitat protection and restoration?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for salmon protection and restoration efforts? For the highest biological priority actions and areas?
- Does the strategy prioritize these actions?
- Does the strategy articulate what community values will be taken into consideration in evaluating and ranking projects?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?
- Does the strategy provide for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists?

Rating: ____Excellent[5] __**X_Good**__ ____Fair ____Poor

---

[4] In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies and prioritizes specific actions and geographic areas for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

[5] The strategy provides for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists; proposes specific actions for building or maintaining community support for highest biological priority actions and areas; lists community values that will be taken into consideration in project evaluation and ranking; and the project evaluation criteria reflect these priorities and values.

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The lead entity's outreach process is good.

The strategy includes innovative ideas about generating community support.

Community issues are considered in the project ranking process and there is some discussion of actions being taken to increase community support.

Fit of the Project List to the Strategy

5. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:
- The extent the project list addresses the highest priority action and areas, and
- The extent that those actions and areas benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed processes, and limiting habitat features.

Rating: ____Excellent[6] __X__Good ____Fair ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The description of the nearshore project development proposal indicates it is stemming from two previous nearshore assessments funded by the SRFB.

The description of the top ranked project indicates it follows from the previous assessment work, so it is unclear what additional work is requested here. The project sounds much more like planning than assessment.

The top-ranked project and the fourth-ranked project are mentioned in the high priority actions of the strategy, but the others do not appear to be.

6. Fit of project ranking

The Review Panel will consider the extent the rank order of the project list addresses the highest priority:
- Stocks
- Limiting watershed processes
- Limiting habitat features
- Actions
- Geographic areas
- Community interests

Rating: __X__Excellent[7] ____Good ____Fair ____Poor

---

[6] The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

[7] The rank order of the entire list of projects fits the priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest priorities identified in the strategy and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy, they are lower in the list.

Narrative (rationale for rating):

All projects fit, but this is a concern because stocks were not prioritized; however, the criteria and projects reflect a preference for benefiting multiple species and stocks (i.e., leading to a higher rating than might otherwise have occurred).

Since the strategy does not prioritize geographic areas or actions, the rank of the project list is developed by independent evaluation against the criteria. The list does seem to reflect those criteria, but this opportunistic approach of ranking any project that comes in does not necessarily guide sponsors to the most strategic priorities (as outlined in the SRFB Guide to Lead Entity Strategy Development).

[Note – the 10-15-04 draft report narrative erroneously indicated that this rating was "good," but it was correctly depicted as "excellent" in Table 1 of that report; it is correct here.]

Summary Narrative:

In general, focus and specificity of the strategy, and fit of the list are good.

The rank order of the list is consistent with the level of specificity in the strategy (a reasonable but indeterminate fit to a fairly unfocused strategy).

SRFB 5th Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: **Nisqually**

Specificity and Focus of Strategy

1. *Species and stocks[1]*

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify all of the stocks in the WRIA(s) comprising the lead entity area?
- Is the status of each stock presented?
- Are one or more stocks prioritized for habitat restoration and/or protection actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?

Rating: __X_Excellent[2] ____Good ____Fair ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Treatment of species and stocks in the strategy is complete and clear.

The prioritization of stocks used is one of the more complex approaches, but it is well presented and supported.

While the species priority is not directly evaluated by the ranking criteria, it is implicit because of the way the geographic priorities were selected.

2. *Habitat features and watershed processes*

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify watershed processes (i.e., habitat forming processes) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?
- Does the strategy clearly identify habitat features (i.e., habitat conditions) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?
- Does the strategy prioritize limiting watershed processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize limiting habitat features?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?

Rating: __X_Excellent[3] __X_Good ____Fair ____Poor

---

[1] See *A Guide to Lead Entity Strategy Development*, October 10, 2003, for details.

[2] The strategy clearly identifies all salmonid species stocks in the lead entity area, and the status of each stock; one or more stocks are prioritized; there is a clear and supportable rationale presented to justify the priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

[3] The strategy clearly identifies limiting habitat features and watershed processes and prioritizes these habitat features and watershed processes for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Very good - **Among the best in the state at articulating watershed processes and how they contribute to habitat conditions in the basin**, *but more information on watershed processes and habitat conditions is available that could be incorporated into the strategy materials to provide greater focus for project sponsors.*

The information provided was primarily at a sub-basin scale.

The EDT analysis used does an excellent job of identifying habitat problems for the modeled species and providing a basis for prioritization. EDT itself is less effective and explicit at identifying and prioritizing watershed processes, but the watershed process information is underlying the analysis. The strategy summary gives an overview of watershed processes, but the strategy itself does not.

---

3. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify specific actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed processes?
- Does the strategy identify specific geographic areas associated with prioritized actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities?

Rating: _____Excellent[4] __**X_Good**__ _____Fair _____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The strategy and strategy summary lack action specificity.

The strategy refers to and relies on a considerable amount of information contained in habitat action plan (Appendix 4) in the Nisqually Chinook recovery plan. However, the RP was not provided with and did not review that appendix until the final presentation/discussion with the lead entity. The RP recommends that the lead entity use examples from pertinent documents to concisely illustrate and clarify the logic path and documentation for the prioritization of actions and areas.

The strategy includes a list of prioritized but very general actions in specific geographic areas. It is clearly presented, providing guidance to potential project sponsors, and could be even more valuable if it included more specific projects and sites. It does not appear that the actions in the habitat action plan in the Chinook recovery plan are prioritized.

The ranking criteria do not rely directly on the list of priorities, or reflect action priorities, but they apply the same criteria.

---

[4] In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies and prioritizes specific actions and geographic areas for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

4. Community issues

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify community issues and concerns regarding salmon habitat protection and restoration?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for salmon protection and restoration efforts? For the highest biological priority actions and areas?
- Does the strategy prioritize these actions?
- Does the strategy articulate what community values will be taken into consideration in evaluating and ranking projects?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?
- Does the strategy provide for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists?

Rating: ____Excellent[5] __X_Good ____Fair ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The strategy is good but more information existed than was provided.

There are good examples of outreach in this lead entity through publications such as the Nisqually newsletter, but the summary and strategy do not clearly identify community issues or provide a strategy for addressing highest priority biological priorities and issues.

The lead entity stated that there are no issues associated with organized community opposition, but other possible opposition is not addressed.

The strategy uses an approach primarily through the lead entity, and there are also specific actions listed that are taken by other organizations to build community support. However, these actions are not prioritized.

The project ranking criteria address both the level of current support and the potential for the project to increase community support. Part of the value of having the strategy clearly identifying salmon recovery actions that do and do not enjoy strong community support is to guide additional project sponsors toward successful projects.

Fit of the Project List to the Strategy

5. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:
- The extent the project list addresses the highest priority action and areas, and
- The extent that those actions and areas benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed processes, and limiting habitat features.

Rating: __X__Excellent[6] ____Good ____Fair ____Poor

---

[5] The strategy provides for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists; proposes specific actions for building or maintaining community support for highest biological priority actions and areas; lists community values that will be taken into consideration in project evaluation and ranking; and the project evaluation criteria reflect these priorities and values.

[6] The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

Narrative (rationale for rating):

All projects seem to address highest priority areas.

Although rated excellent, the RP was confused by the statements in the strategy and answers to questions regarding relative priorities, and note that there is room to be more clear in this regard.

---

6. Fit of project *ranking*

The Review Panel will consider the extent the rank <u>order</u> of the project list addresses the highest priority:
- Stocks
- Limiting watershed processes
- Limiting habitat features
- Actions
- Geographic areas
- Community interests

Rating: **X Excellent**[7]   ____Good   ____Fair   ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The fit of project ranking is well articulated.

The scoring criteria and resulting list are consistent with the strategy.

The RP recommends emphasis on continuing to focus future work on completing the highest priorities as much as possible first (as with the estuary, where they suggest all practical projects are already underway).

Summary Narrative:

In general, the focus and specificity of the strategy, and the fit of list are very good.

The rank order of the list is consistent with the level of specificity in the strategy (an excellent fit to a well focused strategy).

---

[7] The rank <u>order</u> of the entire list of projects fits the priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest priorities identified in the strategy and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy, they are lower in the list.

SRFB 5th Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: **North Olympic Peninsula Lead Entity**

Specificity and Focus of Strategy
1. Species and stocks[1]
The Review Panel will consider: • Does the strategy clearly identify all of the stocks in the WRIA(s) comprising the lead entity area? • Is the status of each stock presented? • Are one or more stocks prioritized for habitat restoration and/or protection actions? • Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities? • Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?
Rating: ____Excellent[2] __X_Good ____Fair ____Poor
Narrative (rationale for rating): *The stocks in each geographic unit are identified, their federal listing and state status is noted, and additional estimations of trends by the lead entity are provided.* *Prioritization of habitat areas is based in part on the status of stocks. So, although the stocks themselves are not prioritized, there is some implicit prioritization given to listed species.*
2. Habitat features and watershed processes
The Review Panel will consider: • Does the strategy clearly identify watershed processes (i.e., habitat forming processes) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks? • Does the strategy clearly identify habitat features (i.e., habitat conditions) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks? • Does the strategy prioritize limiting watershed processes? • Does the strategy prioritize limiting habitat features? • Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities? • Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?
Rating: ____Excellent[3] __X_Good ____Fair ____Poor
Narrative (rationale for rating): *Limiting factors and watershed analyses were used, but watershed processes referenced were very unfocused and unclear.* *Some of the areas have more detail than others, and watershed processes are only treated superficially, but the strategy does point to high priority limiting factors based on the limiting factors analysis and additional lead entity work.*

---

[1] See *A Guide to Lead Entity Strategy Development*, October 10, 2003, for details.

[2] The strategy clearly identifies all salmonid species stocks in the lead entity area, and the status of each stock; one or more stocks are prioritized; there is a clear and supportable rationale presented to justify the priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

[3] The strategy clearly identifies limiting habitat features and watershed processes and prioritizes these habitat features and watershed processes for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

3. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify specific actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed processes?
- Does the strategy identify specific geographic areas associated with prioritized actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities?

Rating: ___**X_Excellent**[4]   ____Good   ____Fair   ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Note – this is among the clearest and most focused treatment of actions and areas reviewed by the RP.

The lead entity area is divided into 24 geographical units. Using clear and explicit criteria, 13 of them were selected as tier 1 areas. The others go into tiers 2 through 4.

In some (but not all) of the areas, there are very specific lists of prioritized actions based on criteria.

The ranking criteria clearly and explicitly implement the priorities in the strategy.

4. Community issues

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify community issues and concerns regarding salmon habitat protection and restoration?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for salmon protection and restoration efforts? For the highest biological priority actions and areas?
- Does the strategy prioritize these actions?
- Does the strategy articulate what community values will be taken into consideration in evaluating and ranking projects?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?
- Does the strategy provide for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists?

Rating: ____Excellent[5]   __**X_Good**   ____Fair   ____Poor

---

[4] In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies and prioritizes specific actions and geographic areas for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

[5] The strategy provides for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists; proposes specific actions for building or maintaining community support for highest biological priority actions and areas; lists community values that will be taken into consideration in project evaluation and ranking; and the project evaluation criteria reflect these priorities and values.

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Extensive outreach is evident, but more could be done to develop a strategic approach to community needs/issues, including specifically prioritized community actions to proactively address the highest priority biological needs/issues.

A clear process for incorporating community values is described and the scoring criteria consider whether the project will build community support and other values.

Actions are described for building community support, but they are not prioritized.

There are some project types that do not currently have community support, and it is not clear if specific actions are underway or planned to address this.

Fit of the Project List to the Strategy

5. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:
- The extent the project list addresses the highest priority action and areas, and
- The extent that those actions and areas benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed processes, and limiting habitat features.

Rating: ____Excellent[6]   **__X_Good**   ____Fair   ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Most of the projects are in tier 1 watersheds, but some are in tier 2 watersheds.

Most projects appear to be consistent with the strategy.

In areas where the strategy has prioritized lists, the projects tend to be on those lists, but not necessarily at the top. For example, in the Dungeness, the LWD and Water Conservation projects are ranked #1 and #2 on the lead entity prioritized list. They are prioritized in the strategy as #6 and #4, but the higher priority projects are either already underway or moving more slowly due to socio-political reasons.

6. Fit of project _ranking_

The Review Panel will consider the extent the rank _order_ of the project list addresses the highest priority:
- Stocks
- Limiting watershed processes
- Limiting habitat features
- Actions
- Geographic areas
- Community interests

Rating: **__X_Excellent**[7]   ____Good   ____Fair   ____Poor

---

[6] The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

[7] The rank _order_ of the entire list of projects fits the priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest priorities identified in the strategy and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy, they are lower in the list.

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The lead entity uses a very transparent approach to ranking.

The ranking generally follows priorities that are explicit and implicit in the strategy.

There are some cases, as with the two top projects in the Dungeness, where the projects appear in a different order than the priorities in the strategy.

Summary Narrative:

In general, the focus and specificity of the strategy and fit of the list are good.

The rank order of the list is consistent with the level of specificity in the strategy (an excellent fit to a fairly well focused strategy).

RP recognizes the high degree of complexity and effort required across this diverse lead entity area (e.g., includes areas with listed species, and other areas without listings).

SRFB 5th Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: Okanogan County/Colville Tribe

Specificity and Focus of Strategy

1. Species and stocks[1]

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify all of the stocks in the WRIA(s) comprising the lead entity area?
- Is the status of each stock presented?
- Are one or more stocks prioritized for habitat restoration and/or protection actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?

Rating: ____Excellent[2] **__X_Good** ____Fair ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The RP did not find the strategy summary informative.

The strategy identifies the stocks, identifies their status and focal species for each assessment unit, but it does not explicitly prioritize the stocks.

Stock priorities are not reflected in the project ranking criteria, although they may be considered by the Regional Technical Team.

Coho are identified as extirpated, but no mention of their reintroduction to the area is provided.

2. Habitat features and watershed processes

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify watershed processes (i.e., habitat forming processes) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?
- Does the strategy clearly identify habitat features (i.e., habitat conditions) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?
- Does the strategy prioritize limiting watershed processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize limiting habitat features?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?

Rating: ____Excellent[3] **__X_Good** ____Fair ____Poor

---

[1] See *A Guide to Lead Entity Strategy Development*, October 10, 2003, for details.

[2] The strategy clearly identifies all salmonid species stocks in the lead entity area, and the status of each stock; one or more stocks are prioritized; there is a clear and supportable rationale presented to justify the priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

[3] The strategy clearly identifies limiting habitat features and watershed processes and prioritizes these habitat features and watershed processes for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Habitat features are identified and prioritized by assessment unit, but watershed processes are not clearly identified or prioritized, and linkages between habitat features and watershed processes are not clarified.

The EDT model runs clearly identify the habitat factors that are believed to be most significant in each assessment unit for the species that were modeled.

The large number of assessment units and the large number of limiting factors and strategies in each one (often 30 or more strategies) made it very difficult to determine what should be done <u>first</u> to protect and restore and protect salmon.

---

3. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify specific actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed processes?
- Does the strategy identify specific geographic areas associated with prioritized actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities?

Rating: ____Excellent[4]   **__X_Good**   ____Fair   ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The strategy identifies a very detailed list of actions, but they are not prioritized.

Assessment units are prioritized based on EDT. For each assessment unit, primary and secondary habitat issues are identified, and within each of them numerous strategies are identified. All of this assessment work is outstanding, and it may be most useful if some additional planning work is done to determine what specific actions should be taken and in what sequence to address habitat features and watershed processes.

[Note –
Geographic boundaries of the area covered are unclear. The strategy covers all of the county, but then says that is all of WRIA 48 and 49 plus part of 60. In the presentation, the RP heard that only the Okanogan and Methow watersheds are covered by the strategy, which leaves out portions of WRIA 48 and 49 on the mainstem Columbia.]

---

[4] In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies and prioritizes specific actions and geographic areas for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

4. Community issues

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify community issues and concerns regarding salmon habitat protection and restoration?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for salmon protection and restoration efforts? For the highest biological priority actions and areas?
- Does the strategy prioritize these actions?
- Does the strategy articulate what community values will be taken into consideration in evaluating and ranking projects?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?
- Does the strategy provide for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists?

Rating: ____Excellent[5]   ____Good   **__X_Fair**   ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Considerable outreach and participation is evident but a clear strategic approach to enable addressing the highest priority biological actions and areas is not.

The primary method given for identifying and incorporating community interests is through the project ranking process. The strategy summary lists characteristics that generally lead to higher or lower community support, but it does not say what projects meet those characteristics and what steps will be taken to increase support.

Fit of the Project List to the Strategy

5. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:
- The extent the project list addresses the highest priority action and areas, and
- The extent that those actions and areas benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed processes, and limiting habitat features.

Rating: ____Excellent[6]   **__X_Good**   ____Fair   ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

It's unclear how highest priority actions are addressed, since actions are not prioritized.

The summary of the fit to list focuses on the process and does not discuss (and perhaps obscures) how well this particular list of projects matches the strategy.

Based on RP review of the priorities (assessment units and primary/secondary factors within those assessment units), all but one of the projects occurs in high priority assessment units and all but one addresses primary factors within those assessment units.

---

[5] The strategy provides for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists; proposes specific actions for building or maintaining community support for highest biological priority actions and areas; lists community values that will be taken into consideration in project evaluation and ranking; and the project evaluation criteria reflect these priorities and values.

[6] The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

6. Fit of project _ranking_
The Review Panel will consider the extent the rank <u>order</u> of the project list addresses the highest priority:
- Stocks   - Limiting watershed processes   - Limiting habitat features   - Actions   - Geographic areas   - Community interests

Rating: ____Excellent[7]   **_X_Good**   ____Fair   ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The temperature assessment in a B priority assessment unit is ranked above several other projects in A priority assessment units.

The ranking system provided is not clear so rank order is also unclear.

The method of ranking projects and combining the ranks of individual reviewers makes it difficult to determine how much influence the strategic priorities have on the final rank order of the list.

Summary Narrative:

In general, the focus and specificity of the strategy, and the fit of the list is fairly good.

---

[7] The rank <u>order</u> of the entire list of projects fits the priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest priorities identified in the strategy and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy, they are lower in the list.

SRFB 5th Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: Pacific County

Specificity and Focus of Strategy

1. Species and stocks[1]

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify all of the stocks in the WRIA(s) comprising the lead entity area?
- Is the status of each stock presented?
- Are one or more stocks prioritized for habitat restoration and/or protection actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?

Rating: ____Excellent[2]   ____Good   **X Fair**   ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The strategy does not identify <u>all</u> the stocks and their status.

Stocks/species are not prioritized. Salmon and steelhead are indicated as general priorities. Economic or recreational values should be considered to aid prioritization.

There are no species listed under the ESA in this area.

Stock status does not play into the project ranking criteria.

2. Habitat features and watershed processes

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify watershed processes (i.e., habitat forming processes) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?
- Does the strategy clearly identify habitat features (i.e., habitat conditions) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?
- Does the strategy prioritize limiting watershed processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize limiting habitat features?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?

Rating: ____Excellent[3]   ____Good   **X Fair**   ____Poor

---

[1] See *A Guide to Lead Entity Strategy Development*, October 10, 2003, for details.

[2] The strategy clearly identifies all salmonid species stocks in the lead entity area, and the status of each stock; one or more stocks are prioritized; there is a clear and supportable rationale presented to justify the priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

[3] The strategy clearly identifies limiting habitat features and watershed processes and prioritizes these habitat features and watershed processes for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Partial prioritization of habitat conditions, and watershed processes were not identified or prioritized.

The strategy relies completely on limiting factors analysis, which results in an unprioritized list of the factors that appear to be impacting fish populations.

The lead entity presentation pointed out that past forestry practices and road building have had impacts throughout the watershed, affecting all the subwatersheds. There are no major dams in the area, only a small human population, and no industrial pollution.

---

3. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify specific actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed processes?
- Does the strategy identify specific geographic areas associated with prioritized actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities?

Rating: ____Excellent[4]   **_X_Good**   ____Fair   ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Actions within Nemah and Naselle are clearly prioritized, but not across or within other parts of the lead entity area.

Geographic areas and limiting factors are not prioritized (by choice). For the Nemah and Naselle, excellent, prioritized lists of potential projects are provided. In other areas, the strategy gives narrative descriptions of projects that would be appropriate in each of the geographic areas.

They are not prioritized and they do not specify locations or specific projects within the subareas.

The level of detail in the specific recommendations for assessments is outstanding, and the strategy could guide project implementation even better if the restoration and protection projects were as clearly presented and prioritized for the other areas as they are for the Nemah and Naselle.

The project scoring is done with scoring sheets that reflect the general SRFB criteria, but do not tie clearly into the strategy.

---

[4] In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies and prioritizes specific actions and geographic areas for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

4. Community issues
The Review Panel will consider: • Does the strategy clearly identify community issues and concerns regarding salmon habitat protection and restoration? • Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for salmon protection and restoration efforts? For the highest biological priority actions and areas? • Does the strategy prioritize these actions? • Does the strategy articulate what community values will be taken into consideration in evaluating and ranking projects? • Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities? • Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities? • Does the strategy provide for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists?
Rating: ____Excellent[5] ____Good **__X_Fair** ____Poor
Narrative (rationale for rating): *Community support for projects is noted but a strategic approach to address unmet needs is not included.* *Project scoring and ranking processes take into account community issues.* *The approach could be strengthened by considering which types of projects are likely to have support and by developing a plan for increasing support for needed high priority actions.*

Fit of the Project List to the Strategy
5. Actions and geographic areas
The Review Panel will consider: • The extent the project list addresses the highest priority action and areas, and • The extent that those actions and areas benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed processes, and limiting habitat features.
Rating: ____Excellent[6] **__X_Good** ____Fair ____Poor
Narrative (rationale for rating): *The top ranked project, Johnson Creek restoration, shows up in the strategy as the 5th ranked project in the Naselle River subwatershed (higher ranked projects will need additional effort to get the private landowners to sign on).* *Some of the other projects are mentioned, some are not.*

---

[5] The strategy provides for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists; proposes specific actions for building or maintaining community support for highest biological priority actions and areas; lists community values that will be taken into consideration in project evaluation and ranking; and the project evaluation criteria reflect these priorities and values.

[6] The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

6. Fit of project _ranking_

The Review Panel will consider the extent the rank <u>order</u> of the project list addresses the highest priority:

- Stocks
- Limiting watershed processes
- Limiting habitat features
- Actions
- Geographic areas
- Community interests

Rating: _____Excellent[7] _____Good **X Fair** _____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Given limitations in previous questions, it was difficult to understand the process and rationale for ranked list.

It is not fully clear why Bear River appears on bottom of list.

The rank order appears fairly consistent with the strategy.

The top project is at least specifically called for in the strategy. For the others, it is impossible to know from the submitted materials how closely the rank order matches the strategic priorities.

Summary Narrative:

In general, the focus and specificity of the strategy are fair, and the fit of the list is fair.

The rank order of the list is consistent with the level of specificity in the strategy (an excellent fit to a rather unfocused strategy).

RP encourages re-evaluation of approach to more strategically address community issue needs.

---

[7] The rank <u>order</u> of the entire list of projects fits the priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest priorities identified in the strategy and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy, they are lower in the list.

SRFB 5th Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: Pend Oreille Conservation District

Specificity and Focus of Strategy

1. Species and stocks[1]

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify all of the stocks in the WRIA(s) comprising the lead entity area?
- Is the status of each stock presented?
- Are one or more stocks prioritized for habitat restoration and/or protection actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?

Rating: ____Excellent[2]   **X Good**   ____Fair   ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Species are identified (except brook trout) but status for all and rationale for prioritization could be clearer.

The project ranking criteria give preference to projects that benefit multiple species or unique populations of ESA-listed species.

The strategic priority of bull trout first, followed by westslope cutthroat trout and pygmy whitefish, could be more clearly expressed in the ranking criteria.

2. Habitat features and watershed processes

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify watershed processes (i.e., habitat forming processes) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?
- Does the strategy clearly identify habitat features (i.e., habitat conditions) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?
- Does the strategy prioritize limiting watershed processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize limiting habitat features?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?

Rating: ____Excellent[3]   **X Good**   ____Fair   ____Poor

---

[1] See *A Guide to Lead Entity Strategy Development*, October 10, 2003, for details.

[2] The strategy clearly identifies all salmonid species stocks in the lead entity area, and the status of each stock; one or more stocks are prioritized; there is a clear and supportable rationale presented to justify the priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

[3] The strategy clearly identifies limiting habitat features and watershed processes and prioritizes these habitat features and watershed processes for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The focus is more on habitat features than on watershed processes.

Based on limiting factors analysis, habitat features are identified but not clearly prioritized.

Watershed processes are not clearly identified or prioritized.

Unlike most other strategies, to its credit this strategy acknowledges that the specific factor(s) currently limiting the salmonid populations is/are not known with certainty. Factors that are known to be significant are identified, as they are in other strategies.

---

3. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify specific actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed processes?
- Does the strategy identify specific geographic areas associated with prioritized actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities?

Rating: **_X_Excellent**[4]   ____Good   ____Fair   ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The strategy clearly identifies and prioritizes specific actions by subarea.

The clear and rational treatment of priority areas and priority actions within those areas is excellent, and is directly tied to the ranking criteria.

Identified actions are fairly specific, which should help guide project sponsors to the top priority actions.

---

4. Community issues

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify community issues and concerns regarding salmon habitat protection and restoration?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for salmon protection and restoration efforts? For the highest biological priority actions and areas?
- Does the strategy prioritize these actions?
- Does the strategy articulate what community values will be taken into consideration in evaluating and ranking projects?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?
- Does the strategy provide for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists?

Rating: ____Excellent[5]   **__X_Good**   ____Fair   ____Poor

---

[4] In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies and prioritizes specific actions and geographic areas for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

Narrative (rationale for rating):

This strategy is among the best in this rating category, and *would have received an excellent rating if more specific actions were identified, along with better description of linkages between projects and geographic areas.*

The estimate of the level of community support for each action in the table of priority actions is excellent, as is the basic approach to encouraging implementation of supported projects while building support for high priority projects that don't currently have support.

Information about the specific methods for outreach and education could be improved.

Fit of the Project List to the Strategy

5. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:
- The extent the project list addresses the highest priority action and areas, and
- The extent that those actions and areas benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed processes, and limiting habitat features.

Rating: __X_Excellent[6] ____Good ____Fair ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

All three projects are in the highest priority areas.

The list of projects submitted is consistent with the list of actions in the strategy.

While there are some other actions that are identified as higher priorities than projects submitted in this round, they have less community support and apparently are not ripe for this round.

6. Fit of project _ranking_

The Review Panel will consider the extent the rank _order_ of the project list addresses the highest priority:
- Stocks
- Limiting watershed processes
- Limiting habitat features
- Actions
- Geographic areas
- Community interests

Rating: __X_Excellent[7] ____Good ____Fair ____Poor

---

[5] The strategy provides for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists; proposes specific actions for building or maintaining community support for highest biological priority actions and areas; lists community values that will be taken into consideration in project evaluation and ranking; and the project evaluation criteria reflect these priorities and values.

[6] The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

[7] The rank _order_ of the entire list of projects fits the priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest priorities identified in the strategy and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy, they are lower in the list.

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The rank order of the list is consistent with the strategy.

The number one ranked project is clearly identified in the strategy as a higher priority action than the other two.

The assessment and the screening projects are both assigned the same priority.

Summary Narrative:

In general, the focus and specificity of the strategy, and the fit of the list are very good.

The rank order of the list is consistent with the level of specificity in the strategy (an excellent fit to a fairly well focused strategy).

SRFB 5th Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: **Pierce County**

Specificity and Focus of Strategy

1. *Species and stocks*[1]

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify all of the stocks in the WRIA(s) comprising the lead entity area?
- Is the status of each stock presented?
- Are one or more stocks prioritized for habitat restoration and/or protection actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?

Rating: ____Excellent[2]   **__X_Good**   ____Fair   ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

All species and their status are identified and prioritized in the strategy, but the rationale for project ranking priorities doesn't fully reflect those priorities.

The strategy describes the priority species and stocks and the rationale for making them priorities; however, it indicates that the process of describing all SaSI stocks and their status is still in progress. That information is provided in the summary, but it was not available to potential project sponsors and it has not been incorporated into the summary at this time.

The project ranking criteria give priority to "high benefit" projects without regard to species, etc.

2. *Habitat features and watershed processes*

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify watershed processes (i.e., habitat forming processes) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?
- Does the strategy clearly identify habitat features (i.e., habitat conditions) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?
- Does the strategy prioritize limiting watershed processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize limiting habitat features?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?

Rating: ____Excellent[3]   **__X_Good**   ____Fair   ____Poor

---

[1] See *A Guide to Lead Entity Strategy Development*, October 10, 2003, for details.

[2] The strategy clearly identifies all salmonid species stocks in the lead entity area, and the status of each stock; one or more stocks are prioritized; there is a clear and supportable rationale presented to justify the priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

[3] The strategy clearly identifies limiting habitat features and watershed processes and prioritizes these habitat features and watershed processes for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Watershed processes are addressed but only weakly, and linkages between them and habitat features are weakly addressed.

The strategy describes and prioritizes the limiting factors based on EDT and other analyses. The discussion is primarily centered on habitat features rather than watershed processes, although it does talk about the impact of Mud Mountain Dam and the Lake Tapps diversion on habitat features.

3. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify specific actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed processes?
- Does the strategy identify specific geographic areas associated with prioritized actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities?

Rating: __X_Excellent[4]   ____Good   ____Fair   ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Generally excellent but definition and delineation of specific actions could be improved.

The strategy identifies reaches and geographic areas and the activities that are prioritized there based on prioritized species and their habitat requirements.

4. Community issues

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify community issues and concerns regarding salmon habitat protection and restoration?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for salmon protection and restoration efforts? For the highest biological priority actions and areas?
- Does the strategy prioritize these actions?
- Does the strategy articulate what community values will be taken into consideration in evaluating and ranking projects?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?
- Does the strategy provide for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists?

Rating: ____Excellent[5]   __X_Good   ____Fair   ____Poor

---

[4] In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies and prioritizes specific actions and geographic areas for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

[5] The strategy provides for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists; proposes specific actions for building or maintaining community support for highest biological priority actions and areas; lists community values that will be taken into consideration in project evaluation and ranking; and the project evaluation criteria reflect these priorities and values.

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Good outreach and support building is evident, but prioritization of needs and strategic approach to address them is not included.

The strategy very clearly describes building support, and the ranking criteria include social and economic considerations to help build that support.

There is no discussion of specific types of projects that do and do not have community support, so it is difficult to determine whether the outreach program will build community support for identified stock, habitat/processes, action/area priorities.

Fit of the Project List to the Strategy

5. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:
- The extent the project list addresses the highest priority action and areas, and
- The extent that those actions and areas benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed processes, and limiting habitat features.

Rating: ___X_Excellent[6] ____Good ____Fair ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The strategy indicates that all of the projects are identified high priorities, except that the strategy calls for LWD and riparian improvements in Boise Creek rather than relocation.

The feasibility study of the fish screen is particularly encouraging since the strategy suggested that sponsorship of such a project might not be available in the near term.

6. Fit of project ranking

The Review Panel will consider the extent the rank order of the project list addresses the highest priority:
- Stocks
- Limiting watershed processes
- Limiting habitat features
- Actions
- Geographic areas
- Community interests

Rating: ___X_Excellent[7] ____Good ____Fair ____Poor

---

[6] The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

[7] The rank order of the entire list of projects fits the priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest priorities identified in the strategy and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy, they are lower in the list.

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Projects on the list are all identified as high priorities. However, it is unclear how scoring criteria relate to and are aligned with rank order.

The order of the list appears to be consistent with the strategy, and the fit is described well in the strategy summary.

Summary Narrative:

In general, focus and specificity of the strategy are good and fit of the list is excellent.

The RP recognizes substantial progress with strategy development.

The rank order of the list is consistent with the level of specificity in the strategy (an excellent fit to a somewhat unfocused strategy).

Note – the lead entity indicated the intent to bolster its strategic approach to identifying and addressing community issue needs.

SRFB 5th Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: Quinault Nation

Specificity and Focus of Strategy

1. Species and stocks[1]

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify all of the stocks in the WRIA(s) comprising the lead entity area?
- Is the status of each stock presented?
- Are one or more stocks prioritized for habitat restoration and/or protection actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?

Rating: ____Excellent[2]   ____Good   ____Fair   __**X_Poor**__

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The strategy did not identify _all_ stocks and their status.

Some stocks were prioritized as "stocks of concern." The rationale for the prioritization used needs to be clarified in the strategy. The strategy lists stocks that are present, but does not detail their status or prioritize among them, other than to identify "stocks of concern."

The strategy summary does not list the stocks other than stocks of concern that are present.

In an upcoming strategy revision, Queets Chinook, Queets coho, and Quinault sockeye are expected to be the highest priorities, and Quinault Chinook and Quinault coho will be designated as substantive priorities. These choices will be made based primarily on community (mostly tribal) values such as cultural value and commercial value. In the presentation, the RP was informed about status according to the limiting factors analysis (based on SaSI) and Quinault Indian Nation information.

The project ranking method does not use explicit criteria.

2. Habitat features and watershed processes

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify watershed processes (i.e., habitat forming processes) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?
- Does the strategy clearly identify habitat features (i.e., habitat conditions) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?
- Does the strategy prioritize limiting watershed processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize limiting habitat features?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?

Rating: ____Excellent[3]   ____Good   __**X_Fair**__   ____Poor

---

[1] See _A Guide to Lead Entity Strategy Development_, October 10, 2003, for details.

[2] The strategy clearly identifies all salmonid species stocks in the lead entity area, and the status of each stock; one or more stocks are prioritized; there is a clear and supportable rationale presented to justify the priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

[3] The strategy clearly identifies limiting habitat features and watershed processes and prioritizes these

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Some limiting factors were mentioned in the strategy summary, but they were not clearly prioritized in the strategy.

Watershed processes information was underutilized.

Rationale for habitat features and processes exists but is weakly developed.

---

3. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify specific actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed processes?
- Does the strategy identify specific geographic areas associated with prioritized actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities?

Rating: ____Excellent[4]   ____Good   **X_Fair**   ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Areas are prioritized based on "species of concern." Actions are not clear or well developed in the strategy.

Areas are prioritized by where the most fish and fisheries are, which is correlated with the size and complexity of the salmon populations they support. Population size and priority are tightly correlated.

The strategy does not identify or prioritize protection and restoration actions, but the summary does give some potential types of projects that may improve conditions.

The project ranking criteria, while not fixed on a numerical scale, do give consideration to the priority geographic areas.

---

habitat features and watershed processes for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

[4] In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies and prioritizes specific actions and geographic areas for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

4. Community issues

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify community issues and concerns regarding salmon habitat protection and restoration?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for salmon protection and restoration efforts? For the highest biological priority actions and areas?
- Does the strategy prioritize these actions?
- Does the strategy articulate what community values will be taken into consideration in evaluating and ranking projects?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?
- Does the strategy provide for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists?

Rating: ____Excellent[5]   ____Good   ____Fair   **__X_Poor**

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Community issues receive negligible treatment in strategy.

The strategy summary describes the community support for habitat restoration and its connection to maintaining sport fisheries.

The project ranking approach and open meetings provide for discussion of community issues.

Additional strategic guidance could be provided to potential project sponsors on what types of projects need to enjoy more community support in order to address the highest biological priority needs.

The RP acknowledges there are very few stakeholder organizations active in the WRIA.

Fit of the Project List to the Strategy

5. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:
- The extent the project list addresses the highest priority action and areas, and
- The extent that those actions and areas benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed processes, and limiting habitat features.

Rating: ____Excellent[6]   **__X_Good**   ____Fair   ____Poor

---

[5] The strategy provides for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists; proposes specific actions for building or maintaining community support for highest biological priority actions and areas; lists community values that will be taken into consideration in project evaluation and ranking; and the project evaluation criteria reflect these priorities and values.

[6] The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

Narrative (rationale for rating):

All projects address the single high priority category. Note - this is a concern because stocks, habitat features and actions were not prioritized (i.e., leading to a higher rating than might otherwise have occurred).

All of the projects on the list are in the two top priority watersheds.

The strategy gives preference to projects that are broad in scale or affect watershed processes rather than site-specific conditions. It isn't clear that culvert replacements fit that preference, but they would match up well with the certainty of success criterion.

---

6. Fit of project _ranking_

The Review Panel will consider the extent the rank <u>order</u> of the project list addresses the highest priority:
- Stocks
- Limiting watershed processes
- Limiting habitat features
- Actions
- Geographic areas
- Community interests

Rating: ____Excellent[7]   **__X_Good**   ____Fair   ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The ranking process used was not articulated in strategy (but was discussed by the lead entity with the RP).

The scoring process was outlined (e.g., benefit/cost), but the rationale for ranking is unclear.

Though unable to show rationale, all projects fit with what was provided.

No information was provided on how the rank order of the projects fits the strategy other than saying that the top three are culvert projects and the next one is a broad-scale assessment.

Since the next two projects are also culvert replacements, it isn't clear what differentiated them in the rankings, even after reviewing the available data on the barriers. There may be a clear rationale, but it is not provided in the materials.

[Note – the 10-15-04 draft report narrative erroneously indicated that this rating was "fair," but it was correctly depicted as "good" in Table 1 of that report; it is correct here.]

---

[7] The rank <u>order</u> of the entire list of projects fits the priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest priorities identified in the strategy and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy, they are lower in the list.

Summary Narrative:

In general, the specificity and focus of the strategy, and the fit of the list are relatively weak.

The rank order of the list is consistent with the level of specificity in the strategy (a reasonable but indeterminate fit to an unfocused strategy).

RP acknowledges LE is continuing to make progress with strategy development.

It appears limited amount of institutional capacity in this WRIA may contribute to this strategy being less well developed than most others.

SRFB 5th Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: San Juan Conservation District

Specificity and Focus of Strategy

1. Species and stocks[1]

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify all of the stocks in the WRIA(s) comprising the lead entity area?
- Is the status of each stock presented?
- Are one or more stocks prioritized for habitat restoration and/or protection actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?

Rating: ____Excellent[2]　　____Good　　**X Fair**　　____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The strategy identifies species/stocks as to possible presence, but status information is lacking for <u>all</u> stocks.

Scoring criteria do not appear consistent with priority species in the strategy.

Rationale for priorities is somewhat unclear in the strategy.

The strategy identifies some stocks that are known to have been found in the WRIA as well as some that may or may not be found there.

Because of gaps in available data, it is not possible at this point to identify <u>all</u> of the stocks in the WRIA.

The strategy only includes status information for the three listed species, and there is no guidance or consideration given to unlisted species that may also use the area. Chinook are prioritized first, followed by the other listed species.

It is not clear from the materials provided whether the ranking criteria reflect the priorities.

---

[1] See *A Guide to Lead Entity Strategy Development*, October 10, 2003, for details.

[2] The strategy clearly identifies all salmonid species stocks in the lead entity area, and the status of each stock; one or more stocks are prioritized; there is a clear and supportable rationale presented to justify the priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

2. Habitat features and watershed processes

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify watershed processes (i.e., habitat forming processes) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?
- Does the strategy clearly identify habitat features (i.e., habitat conditions) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?
- Does the strategy prioritize limiting watershed processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize limiting habitat features?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?

Rating: ____Excellent[3] ____Good **_X_Fair** ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The strategy has a conceptual emphasis.

The strategy is hampered by considerable information gaps that exist at this time, but needs for assessments to address information gaps are not prioritized.

Conceptual strategic linkages to salmon are included, but due to limitations of information, the empirical basis is weak.

Reasonable emphasis is on eelgrass and forage fish as limiting factors (or processes).

Prioritization in strategy is generally limited.

The description doesn't address factors limiting stocks that utilize the lead entity area (e.g., as a result of out-of-area effects, in the context of the lead entity area as a migration corridor).

The summary discussion of limiting factors focuses on impacts to forage fish rather than salmon. The connection between the two is made, but there is no data presented to indicate the extent to which forage fish or eelgrass availability limit salmon populations relative to limiting factors identified and modeled in the freshwater systems.

Nearshore habitat features and their importance for migration and nursery grounds are discussed more in the strategy, but it concedes that habitat features in WRIA 2 do not appear to be limiting recovery.

3. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify specific actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed processes?
- Does the strategy identify specific geographic areas associated with prioritized actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities?

Rating: ____Excellent[4] **__X_Good** ____Fair ____Poor

---

[3] The strategy clearly identifies limiting habitat features and watershed processes and prioritizes these habitat features and watershed processes for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

[4] In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies and prioritizes specific actions and geographic

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Description and prioritization of actions/areas is reasonable, given that limiting factors and processes are not prioritized.

Actions are identified to protect and restore eelgrass, forage fish spawning areas and habitat, but they are not prioritized.

The rationale for protection is supportable, but the recommendation for riparian vegetation restoration is not accompanied by a discussion of the severity of historical alteration and the impact on salmon and habitat.

There are geographic priority areas identified via previously funded nearshore assessment projects.

---

4. Community issues

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify community issues and concerns regarding salmon habitat protection and restoration?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for salmon protection and restoration efforts? For the highest biological priority actions and areas?
- Does the strategy prioritize these actions?
- Does the strategy articulate what community values will be taken into consideration in evaluating and ranking projects?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?
- Does the strategy provide for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists?

Rating: ____Excellent[5]   ____Good   **__X_Fair**   ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

General outreach and public participation could be better described in the strategy.

The strategy could be more strategic at addressing the highest priority community issue needs to achieve the highest priority biological needs.

The strategy does not mention community values or actions to build support except in the strategy summary. That section does include a process for ensuring stakeholder input, as well as actions to continue to build community support.

The strategy could be bolstered by being more explicit about what community values will be considered in ranking the projects.

---

areas for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

[5] The strategy provides for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists; proposes specific actions for building or maintaining community support for highest biological priority actions and areas; lists community values that will be taken into consideration in project evaluation and ranking; and the project evaluation criteria reflect these priorities and values.

Fit of the Project List to the Strategy
5. Actions and geographic areas
The Review Panel will consider: • The extent the project list addresses the highest priority action and areas, and   • The extent that those actions and areas benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed processes, and limiting habitat features.
Rating: ____Excellent[6] ____Good **_X_Fair** ____Poor
Narrative (rationale for rating):   *All projects are not highest priority actions and are not for highest priority species/stocks. For example, no projects are related to protection (the highest stated priority in the strategy).*
6. Fit of project <u>ranking</u>
The Review Panel will consider the extent the rank <u>order</u> of the project list addresses the highest priority: • Stocks   • Limiting watershed processes   • Limiting habitat features   • Actions   • Geographic areas   • Community interests
Rating: **__X_Excellent**[7] ____Good ____Fair ____Poor
Narrative (rationale for rating):   *Rank order appears to be consistent with the general priorities in the strategy.*   *The project list seems to emphasize filling information gaps not protection and restoration actions.*

---

[6] The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

[7] The rank <u>order</u> of the entire list of projects fits the priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest priorities identified in the strategy and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy, they are lower in the list.

Summary Narrative:

In general, the focus and specificity of the strategy is fair, as is the fit of the list.

The rank order of the list is consistent with the level of specificity in the strategy (an excellent fit to a fairly unfocused strategy).

SRFB 5th Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: Skagit Watershed Council

Specificity and Focus of Strategy
1. Species and stocks[1]
The Review Panel will consider: • Does the strategy clearly identify all of the stocks in the WRIA(s) comprising the lead entity area?   • Is the status of each stock presented?   • Are one or more stocks prioritized for habitat restoration and/or protection actions?   • Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?   • Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?
Rating: __X_Excellent[2] ____Good ____Fair ____Poor
Narrative (rationale for rating):   *The strategy establishes three tiers of species based on threatened listings under ESA or depressed listing under SaSI or both, and it refers the reader to the limiting factors analysis for details on each of the stocks.*   *The project ranking criteria reflect the stock priorities.*   *A summary table of stocks and their status would be a useful addition to the strategy for potential sponsors that prefer to get all the key information in one document.*
2. Habitat features and watershed processes
The Review Panel will consider: • Does the strategy clearly identify watershed processes (i.e., habitat forming processes) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?   • Does the strategy clearly identify habitat features (i.e., habitat conditions) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?   • Does the strategy prioritize limiting watershed processes?   • Does the strategy prioritize limiting habitat features?   • Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?   • Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?
Rating: __X_Excellent[3] __X_Good ____Fair ____Poor

---

[1] See *A Guide to Lead Entity Strategy Development*, October 10, 2003, for details.

[2] The strategy clearly identifies all salmonid species stocks in the lead entity area, and the status of each stock; one or more stocks are prioritized; there is a clear and supportable rationale presented to justify the priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

[3] The strategy clearly identifies limiting habitat features and watershed processes and prioritizes these habitat features and watershed processes for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Treatment of habitat features and watershed processes is excellent, but transparency could be improved.

The strategy is based on target areas, with the effect that features/processes are <u>indirectly</u> prioritized.

Watershed processes are identified (e.g., sediment, peak flows) for upper areas but not across full breadth of the lead entity area, and limiting watershed processes are not clearly prioritized (other than in a target area).

The strategy could be improved if it prioritized habitat problems or suggested which processes should be addressed first, and if it better addressed linkages between watershed processes and habitat features.

3. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify specific actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed processes?
- Does the strategy identify specific geographic areas associated with prioritized actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities?

Rating: _____Excellent[4]   **__X_Good**   _____Fair   _____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The strategy clearly identifies highest priority (target) areas (tiers) but lacks specific priorities within target areas.

The strategy identifies four general geographic first priority areas, with the estuary as the first among them.

For each area, it describes specific strategies and, in some cases, specific actions that can be taken to restore habitat, but they are not prioritized. The priorities cover large areas and large numbers of actions.

Additional guidance on which reaches of the floodplain, etc., are more important would help guide project sponsors to most important areas first.

---

[4] In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies and prioritizes specific actions and geographic areas for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

4. Community issues

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify community issues and concerns regarding salmon habitat protection and restoration?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for salmon protection and restoration efforts? For the highest biological priority actions and areas?
- Does the strategy prioritize these actions?
- Does the strategy articulate what community values will be taken into consideration in evaluating and ranking projects?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?
- Does the strategy provide for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists?

Rating: ____Excellent[5]   __X_Good   ____Fair   ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The strategy and lead entity provide an excellent outreach process and effort.

The RP recognizes substantial recent expansion in stakeholder involvement (as per project list).

Community actions are not prioritized in strategy.

Treatment of community issues could be improved by being more strategic (prioritized) with a more clearly articulated approach to dealing with those priorities in the strategy.

A strong organizational structure is noted that helps ensure that stakeholders are involved in the process.

The strategy is not clear about specific, prioritized community actions to be taken to build support from the broader array of people and groups that do not participate in the committees.

---

[5] The strategy provides for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists; proposes specific actions for building or maintaining community support for highest biological priority actions and areas; lists community values that will be taken into consideration in project evaluation and ranking; and the project evaluation criteria reflect these priorities and values.

Fit of the Project List to the Strategy

5. *Actions and geographic areas*

The Review Panel will consider:
- The extent the project list addresses the highest priority action and areas, and
- The extent that those actions and areas benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed processes, and limiting habitat features.

Rating: ____Excellent[6]   **__X_Good**   ____Fair   ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

There is a very good alignment of projects with priority stocks, areas, etc., but all projects are not in the highest priority categories.

The high priorities in the strategy include large areas and large numbers of potential actions in those areas. Most of the projects are clearly in these priority areas.

The two creek restoration projects near the bottom of the list are in a second-tier area and supporting second-tier species.

6. Fit of project *ranking*

The Review Panel will consider the extent the rank *order* of the project list addresses the highest priority:
- Stocks
- Limiting watershed processes
- Limiting habitat features
- Actions
- Geographic areas
- Community interests

Rating: **__X_Excellent**[7]   ____Good   ____Fair   ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The rank order is generally consistent with the strategy.

A tier 1 project was on bottom of list because it was deemed not as technically sound as possible.

The projects that are in the top priority areas and addressing the top priority species are at the top of the list.

One of the estuary projects in a tier 2 area ranks above an estuary project in a tier 1 first priority area, but the rationale for this was clearly articulated (based on the causeway project).

The mix of feasibility studies to develop future projects in priority areas is reasonable.

---

[6] The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

[7] The rank *order* of the entire list of projects fits the priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest priorities identified in the strategy and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy, they are lower in the list.

Summary Narrative:

In general, the focus and specificity of the strategy, and fit of the list are very good.

The rank order of the list is consistent with the level of specificity in the strategy (an excellent fit to a fairly well focused strategy).

SRFB 5th Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: Snake River Salmon Recovery Board/Asotin County

Specificity and Focus of Strategy

1. Species and stocks[1]

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify all of the stocks in the WRIA(s) comprising the lead entity area?
- Is the status of each stock presented?
- Are one or more stocks prioritized for habitat restoration and/or protection actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?

Rating: ____Excellent[2]   **_X_Good**   ____Fair   ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Not <u>all</u> species are identified in the strategy but status of those provided is included. All information was not included in the strategy but was provided in the strategy summary.

Listed species are prioritized by tiers.

Since it does not distinguish between the priorities of endangered versus threatened stocks or stocks that may benefit more from early actions, the strategy is not focused on particular species as much as some other strategies are.

The ranking criteria give equal weight to the listed stocks except that sockeye are omitted because they are mainly in the mainstem.

2. Habitat features and watershed processes

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify watershed processes (i.e., habitat forming processes) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?
- Does the strategy clearly identify habitat features (i.e., habitat conditions) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?
- Does the strategy prioritize limiting watershed processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize limiting habitat features?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?

Rating: ____Excellent[3]   **_X_Good**   ____Fair   ____Poor

---

[1] See *A Guide to Lead Entity Strategy Development*, October 10, 2003, for details.

[2] The strategy clearly identifies all salmonid species stocks in the lead entity area, and the status of each stock; one or more stocks are prioritized; there is a clear and supportable rationale presented to justify the priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

[3] The strategy clearly identifies limiting habitat features and watershed processes and prioritizes these habitat features and watershed processes for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The strategy uses an EDT-based approach to habitat features that is comprehensive and well presented, but watershed processes and related tools are not explicitly included.

Identified limiting factors include some watershed processes as well as habitat features, but the linkages between the watershed processes and habitat features is not discussed.

---

3. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify specific actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed processes?
- Does the strategy identify specific geographic areas associated with prioritized actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities?

Rating: ____Excellent[4]   **__X_Good**   ____Fair   ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The rationale for identified actions and areas is not clear in the strategy.

The priorities in the strategy are very explicit: address imminent threats first, address habitat factors that are impacting survival second, and undertake other projects in reaches with ESA-listed species third.

Focus could be improved by concentrating on imminent threats in the high priority areas. Otherwise, a project such as a culvert on a stream with hardly any fish potential would still appear as a top priority.

---

4. Community issues

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify community issues and concerns regarding salmon habitat protection and restoration?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for salmon protection and restoration efforts? For the highest biological priority actions and areas?
- Does the strategy prioritize these actions?
- Does the strategy articulate what community values will be taken into consideration in evaluating and ranking projects?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?
- Does the strategy provide for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists?

Rating: ____Excellent[5]   ____Good   **__X_Fair**   ____Poor

---

[4] In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies and prioritizes specific actions and geographic areas for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

[5] The strategy provides for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists; proposes specific actions for

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The strategy identifies community issues but provides only a general approach at this time.

Linkage of community issues and process to project ranking is not transparent in the strategy.

The strategy includes a good discussion of community issues and the types of projects that are or are not supported.

There is an ongoing public outreach effort, but it is not clear whether any specific actions are underway or planned to build community support where it does not currently exist for projects that have high biological benefits.

It is not clear how the project ranking criteria consider community issues.

Fit of the Project List to the Strategy

5. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:
- The extent the project list addresses the highest priority action and areas, and
- The extent that those actions and areas benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed processes, and limiting habitat features.

Rating: ____Excellent[6]   __X_Good   ____Fair   ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The fairly large number of assessments on the list appears to contradict the stated intent to address imminent treats as the highest priority.

All projects are not in highest priority areas (i.e., Touchet easement), and don't address imminent threats.

The assessment of landowner interest in conservation easements project was re-scoped to address priority areas.

6. Fit of project _ranking_

The Review Panel will consider the extent the rank _order_ of the project list addresses the highest priority:
- Stocks
- Limiting watershed processes
- Limiting habitat features
- Actions
- Geographic areas
- Community interests

Rating: ____Excellent[7]   __X__Good   ___Fair   ____Poor

building or maintaining community support for highest biological priority actions and areas; lists community values that will be taken into consideration in project evaluation and ranking; and the project evaluation criteria reflect these priorities and values.

[6] The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

[7] The rank _order_ of the entire list of projects fits the priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy. That is, the highest

Narrative (rationale for rating):

It is unclear how projects were ranked, (e.g., how assessments fit in rank order), and what determined the final rank order.

It is unclear why the Coppei Creek project is below the Garfield County project, or why Walla Walla assessment is at the top of the list.

Summary Narrative:

In general, the focus and specificity of the strategy, and the fit of the list are fairly good.

Note - The list of projects is long, containing some projects that the lead entity indicated they would not pursue this round.

---

ranked projects fit the highest priorities identified in the strategy and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy, they are lower in the list.

SRFB 5th Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: **Snohomish County**

Specificity and Focus of Strategy
1. *Species and stocks*[1]
The Review Panel will consider: • Does the strategy clearly identify all of the stocks in the WRIA(s) comprising the lead entity area? • Is the status of each stock presented? • Are one or more stocks prioritized for habitat restoration and/or protection actions? • Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities? • Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?
Rating: ____Excellent[2]   **__X_Good**   ____Fair   ____Poor
Narrative (rationale for rating): *The rationale for priority species/stocks identified in the strategy, but not <u>all</u> stocks and their status were identified to achieve an excellent rating.* *The strategy identifies Chinook and coho salmon and bull trout as the "proxy" species for all salmonids in the watershed, but does not clearly prioritize among the species.* *The scoring criteria appear to give weight to unique populations of listed species and naturally spawning non-listed species.*
2. *Habitat features and watershed processes*
The Review Panel will consider: • Does the strategy clearly identify watershed processes (i.e., habitat forming processes) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks? • Does the strategy clearly identify habitat features (i.e., habitat conditions) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks? • Does the strategy prioritize limiting watershed processes? • Does the strategy prioritize limiting habitat features? • Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities? • Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?
Rating: **__X__Excellent[3]**   **__X_Good**   ____Fair   ____Poor

---

[1] See *A Guide to Lead Entity Strategy Development*, October 10, 2003, for details.

[2] The strategy clearly identifies all salmonid species stocks in the lead entity area, and the status of each stock; one or more stocks are prioritized; there is a clear and supportable rationale presented to justify the priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

[3] The strategy clearly identifies limiting habitat features and watershed processes and prioritizes these habitat features and watershed processes for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The strategy recognizes watershed processes (Appendix I), but very generally.

Although habitat features and general watershed processes are identified, the rationale for their prioritization is not clear and transparent.

Appendix I in the strategy does an excellent job of identifying and prioritizing habitat features that are limiting, and it generally describes some of the key watershed processes at the sub-watershed scale. However, Appendix I stops short of prioritizing watershed processes and linking them explicitly to the habitat features in a way that guides selection of projects at a meaningful scale.

---

3. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify specific actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed processes?
- Does the strategy identify specific geographic areas associated with prioritized actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities?

Rating: __**X_Excellent**[4] ____Good ____Fair ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Priority areas, types of projects, and some actions, are identified in the strategy.

The characterization of sub-basins by location, habitat, and salmonid use leads to priority actions in different geographic areas. The rationale is clear, although complex.

The ranking criteria are tied directly to the high priority areas and actions identified in the strategy.

---

4. Community issues

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify community issues and concerns regarding salmon habitat protection and restoration?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for salmon protection and restoration efforts? For the highest biological priority actions and areas?
- Does the strategy prioritize these actions?
- Does the strategy articulate what community values will be taken into consideration in evaluating and ranking projects?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?
- Does the strategy provide for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists?

---

[4] In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies and prioritizes specific actions and geographic areas for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

| Rating: | ____Excellent[5] | __X_Good | ____Fair | ____Poor |

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Issues lacking community support are well identified in the summary provided (but hard to discern in the strategy).

An outreach strategy is included but actions are not targeted to specific issues and are not clearly addressing limiting community issues in a prioritized fashion.

Prioritizing of actions could be more directly and clearly articulated (e.g., Appendix A).

Fit of the Project List to the Strategy

5. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:
- The extent the project list addresses the highest priority action and areas, and
- The extent that those actions and areas benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed processes, and limiting habitat features.

| Rating: | ____Excellent[6] | __X_Good | ____Fair | ____Poor |

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Good prioritization but all projects are not in the highest categories.

The projects are all consistent with the strategy, but they are not all in the highest priority areas (as needed to achieve an excellent rating). For example, the Alpine Baldy Road Decommissioning appears to be in a second priority headwaters area and it is not clear that the Groenveld Slough project is consistent with the watershed process approach.

6. Fit of project ranking

The Review Panel will consider the extent the rank order of the project list addresses the highest priority:
- Stocks
- Limiting watershed processes
- Limiting habitat features
- Actions
- Geographic areas
- Community interests

| Rating: | __X_Excellent[7] | ____Good | ____Fair | ____Poor |

---

[5] The strategy provides for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists; proposes specific actions for building or maintaining community support for highest biological priority actions and areas; lists community values that will be taken into consideration in project evaluation and ranking; and the project evaluation criteria reflect these priorities and values.

[6] The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

[7] The rank order of the entire list of projects fits the priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest priorities identified in the strategy and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy, they are lower in the list.

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Rank order appears to be consistent with the priorities in the strategy.

Summary Narrative:

In general, the focus and specificity of the strategy, and the fit of the list are good.

The rank order of the list is consistent with the level of specificity in the strategy (an excellent fit to a fairly focused strategy).

SRFB 5th Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: **Stillaguamish**

Specificity and Focus of Strategy
1. Species and stocks[1]
The Review Panel will consider: • Does the strategy clearly identify all of the stocks in the WRIA(s) comprising the lead entity area?   • Is the status of each stock presented?   • Are one or more stocks prioritized for habitat restoration and/or protection actions?   • Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?   • Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?
Rating: ____Excellent[2]   __X_Good   ____Fair   ____Poor
Narrative (rationale for rating):   *The strategy prioritizes two Chinook stocks, but the rationale for doing so is not fully clear.*   *The strategy summary only lists and considers Chinook salmon, but the strategy itself lists other stocks.*   *The scoring criteria are consistent with the stock priorities.*
2. Habitat features and watershed processes
The Review Panel will consider: • Does the strategy clearly identify watershed processes (i.e., habitat forming processes) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?   • Does the strategy clearly identify habitat features (i.e., habitat conditions) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?   • Does the strategy prioritize limiting watershed processes?   • Does the strategy prioritize limiting habitat features?   • Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?   • Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?
Rating: ____Excellent[3]   __X_Good   ____Fair   ____Poor

---

[1] See *A Guide to Lead Entity Strategy Development*, October 10, 2003, for details.

[2] The strategy clearly identifies all salmonid species stocks in the lead entity area, and the status of each stock; one or more stocks are prioritized; there is a clear and supportable rationale presented to justify the priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

[3] The strategy clearly identifies limiting habitat features and watershed processes and prioritizes these habitat features and watershed processes for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Good approach to identifying habitat features and watershed processes. **(This is among the best discussions of watershed processes reviewed by the RP.)**

The strategy clearly sets out the limiting factors and watershed processes down to the reach scale. The reaches are then prioritized within the limiting factor categories, but there are no priorities established between limiting factors in the reaches. All limiting factors are treated equally.

The strategy summary establishes priorities for which watershed processes should be addressed first at the watershed level, but not necessarily at the reach level.

3. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify specific actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed processes?
- Does the strategy identify specific geographic areas associated with prioritized actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities?

Rating: **__X_Excellent**[4]   ____Good   ____Fair   ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The strategy includes a very clear description and rationale for prioritization of actions and areas.

Ranking criteria may not capture prioritization as well as they could.

The strategy includes specific actions recommended in specific geographic areas. The actions are prioritized and linked to the limiting factors.

4. Community issues

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify community issues and concerns regarding salmon habitat protection and restoration?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for salmon protection and restoration efforts? For the highest biological priority actions and areas?
- Does the strategy prioritize these actions?
- Does the strategy articulate what community values will be taken into consideration in evaluating and ranking projects?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?
- Does the strategy provide for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists?

Rating: ____Excellent[5]   **__X_Good**   ____Fair   ____Poor

---

[4] In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies and prioritizes specific actions and geographic areas for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The strategy describes some of the important community issues.

The strategy includes a good outreach approach that emphasizes placing examples of needed projects on public ownership first (as demonstration areas).

To be more strategic the community approach could go farther toward building support for highest priority biological needs. The strategy could be stronger if it included additional prioritized actions for building community support.

More was discussed in presentations than was provided in written materials.

Fit of the Project List to the Strategy

5. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:
- The extent the project list addresses the highest priority action and areas, and
- The extent that those actions and areas benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed processes, and limiting habitat features.

Rating: ____Excellent[6] **__X_Good** ____Fair ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The projects are all consistent with the strategy, although the strategy has some higher priority areas and actions than are in the current project list. All projects are not the highest priority actions and areas that would be needed to achieve an excellent rating.

6. Fit of project ranking

The Review Panel will consider the extent the rank order of the project list addresses the highest priority:
- Stocks
- Limiting watershed processes
- Limiting habitat features
- Actions
- Geographic areas
- Community interests

Rating: **__X_Excellent**[7] ____Good ____Fair ____Poor

---

[5] The strategy provides for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists; proposes specific actions for building or maintaining community support for highest biological priority actions and areas; lists community values that will be taken into consideration in project evaluation and ranking; and the project evaluation criteria reflect these priorities and values.

[6] The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

[7] The rank order of the entire list of projects fits the priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest priorities identified in the strategy and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy, they are lower in the list.

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Rank order is consistent with strategy, but the strategy is incomplete or unclear in some respects (e.g., rationale).

That limiting factors were not prioritized tends to diminish value of ranking.

Summary Narrative:

In general, strategy focus and specificity, and fit of the list are good.

The rank order of the list is consistent with the level of specificity in the strategy (an excellent fit to a good strategy that is unfocused in some respects).

SRFB 5th Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: **Thurston Conservation District**

Specificity and Focus of Strategy
1. *Species and stocks*[1]
The Review Panel will consider: • Does the strategy clearly identify all of the stocks in the WRIA(s) comprising the lead entity area? • Is the status of each stock presented? • Are one or more stocks prioritized for habitat restoration and/or protection actions? • Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities? • Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?
Rating: ___**X_Excellent**[2] ____Good ____Fair ____Poor
Narrative (rationale for rating): *Stocks and status are clearly described in the strategy.* *The multispecies approach is supported by the prioritization used (ESA listing and SASSI status).* *Outside of nearshore there is no prioritization of species or stocks.* *Presentation in the strategy of the stocks and their status is clear, but the decision not to prioritize further makes it difficult to be confident that the investments in projects in this watershed are directed in a strategic manner.* *Although rated excellent, improvements could be obtained with additional prioritization within subwatersheds and for nearshore priority species with supporting rationale.*
2. *Habitat features and watershed processes*
The Review Panel will consider: • Does the strategy clearly identify watershed processes (i.e., habitat forming processes) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks? • Does the strategy clearly identify habitat features (i.e., habitat conditions) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks? • Does the strategy prioritize limiting watershed processes? • Does the strategy prioritize limiting habitat features? • Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities? • Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?
Rating: ____Excellent[3] __**X_Good** ____Fair ____Poor

---

[1] See *A Guide to Lead Entity Strategy Development*, October 10, 2003, for details.

[2] The strategy clearly identifies all salmonid species stocks in the lead entity area, and the status of each stock; one or more stocks are prioritized; there is a clear and supportable rationale presented to justify the priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

[3] The strategy clearly identifies limiting habitat features and watershed processes and prioritizes these habitat features and watershed processes for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The strategy well addresses habitat features but watershed processes only weakly.

The rationale for prioritization is not fully clear in the strategy.

Several limiting habitat features and watershed processes are listed, but are not prioritized. The rationale for not prioritizing them is clear, but it is still difficult to determine whether investments in projects will make progress toward strategic goals.

The ranking criteria are fairly general and non-specific regarding species, actions and areas.

3. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify specific actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed processes?
- Does the strategy identify specific geographic areas associated with prioritized actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities?

Rating: ____Excellent[4]   **__X_Good**   ____Fair   ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The strategy did not specifically prioritize across areas, but did better within areas.

Although the strategy does not explicitly prioritize geographic areas, it does provide guidance about the types of projects that should be given emphasis in any given year.

The strategy lists several possible actions that can be taken to address the limiting factors. For each subwatershed, it lists high priority projects and programs and other projects and programs.

This two-tier approach gives some guidance about priorities, but there are so many high priorities that it would be even more useful to prioritize among them by species and/or geographic areas.

Geographic priorities are slated for inclusion in the next iteration of the strategy.

---

[4] In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies and prioritizes specific actions and geographic areas for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

4. Community issues

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify community issues and concerns regarding salmon habitat protection and restoration?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for salmon protection and restoration efforts? For the highest biological priority actions and areas?
- Does the strategy prioritize these actions?
- Does the strategy articulate what community values will be taken into consideration in evaluating and ranking projects?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?
- Does the strategy provide for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists?

Rating: ____Excellent[5] ____Good **__X_Fair** ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Treatment in the strategy of outreach is good, but strategic aspects are limited by lack of specificity (at the subwatershed level), and actions to prioritize and address community support needed to achieve the highest biological priorities.

The strategy includes a list of actions that can be taken, but does not prioritize them. Clarification was provided via presentation but needs to be clarified in the strategy.

The strategy very clearly lists community values that can affect support for projects and provides recommendations for dealing with them **(note – this is among the best in the state in this aspect of this rating category.)**

Fit of the Project List to the Strategy

5. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:
- The extent the project list addresses the highest priority action and areas, and
- The extent that those actions and areas benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed processes, and limiting habitat features.

Rating: ____Excellent[6] ____Good **__X_Fair** ____Poor

---

[5] The strategy provides for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists; proposes specific actions for building or maintaining community support for highest biological priority actions and areas; lists community values that will be taken into consideration in project evaluation and ranking; and the project evaluation criteria reflect these priorities and values.

[6] The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Over half of projects on the list are studies/feasibility/design. All projects do not appear to be fully consistent with the strategy.

Three of the five projects on the list are studies that may not lead to projects.

One of them (nearshore) does commit to identifying and doing preliminary design on projects in the nearshore, which seems consistent with the strategy and SRFB guidance (but was not found it in the strategy).

It is not clear that there are commitments to implement projects based on the other two. The Capitol Lake study is called for in the strategy, but it will consider estuarine restoration and other alternatives, so the chosen alternative might not include estuarine restoration. Note – this project addresses a data gap identified in the strategy.

The water-typing project does not appear to be directed toward future projects and it was not found in the strategy.

The other two projects address fish passage, which is one of the myriad priorities mentioned in the strategy.

---

6. Fit of project <u>ranking</u>

The Review Panel will consider the extent the rank <u>order</u> of the project list addresses the highest priority:
- Stocks
- Limiting watershed processes
- Limiting habitat features
- Actions
- Geographic areas
- Community interests

Rating: _____Excellent[7]   **__X_Good**   _____Fair   _____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The ranking of the projects does not seem directly tied to the strategy.

The lead entity clarified the role of ESA listings and SASSI status in prioritization.

The water-typing project, in particular, is not listed in the strategy (although instream assessment is) yet it is ranked above a fish passage project specifically named in the strategy.

Since species and specific geographic priorities are not established in the strategy, the RP was unable to conclude that other projects on the list are ranked inconsistent with the strategy.

---

[7] The rank <u>order</u> of the entire list of projects fits the priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest priorities identified in the strategy and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy, they are lower in the list.

Summary Narrative:

In general, specificity and focus of the strategy are fairly good, as is the fit of the list.

SRFB 5th Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: **Whatcom County**

Specificity and Focus of Strategy

1. Species and stocks[1]

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify all of the stocks in the WRIA(s) comprising the lead entity area?
- Is the status of each stock presented?
- Are one or more stocks prioritized for habitat restoration and/or protection actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?

Rating: ___**X_Excellent**[2] ____Good ____Fair ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The strategy very clearly identifies the status and priorities of all stocks.

The species and their listing status are clearly presented, along with some explanations of the status and recent data.

Species are clearly prioritized with very clear rationale in the strategy.

The project ranking criteria clearly give more points to projects that benefit the priority species.

The project ranking criteria are based on the benefits to specific species, and presumably different point values were assigned, but they are not listed in the strategy.

2. Habitat features and watershed processes

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify watershed processes (i.e., habitat forming processes) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?
- Does the strategy clearly identify habitat features (i.e., habitat conditions) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?
- Does the strategy prioritize limiting watershed processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize limiting habitat features?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?

Rating: ___**X__Excellent**[3] ____Good ____Fair ____Poor

---

[1] See *A Guide to Lead Entity Strategy Development*, October 10, 2003, for details.

[2] The strategy clearly identifies all salmonid species stocks in the lead entity area, and the status of each stock; one or more stocks are prioritized; there is a clear and supportable rationale presented to justify the priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

[3] The strategy clearly identifies limiting habitat features and watershed processes and prioritizes these habitat features and watershed processes for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Tables are very good, but narratives identifying and prioritizing habitat limiting factors and watershed processes would be very helpful.

The strategy describes watershed processes and emphasizes a process-based approach to protection and restoration.

The strategy could be improved by identifying the highest priority watershed processes, and addressing linkages between watershed processes and habitat features.

Restoration of habitat elements is given a lower priority and requires assessment and consideration of long-term treatments.

Through EDT, the strategy identifies the limiting factors that are important for individual reaches, and these are prioritized and used as a basis for project ranking.

3. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify specific actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed processes?
- Does the strategy identify specific geographic areas associated with prioritized actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities?

Rating: ____Excellent[4]   __X_Good   ____Fair   ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

There is a very good description of actions and areas in the strategy.

Areas are prioritized in the strategy but not specific actions.

The strategy describes a variety of actions that can be taken in pursuit of the objectives.

The strategy prioritizes actions in general categories (i.e., protection above restoration above rehabilitation) and there are priorities for protection based on criteria, but not at the individual action or project level.

The tables that show which limiting factors are most important in which geographic areas, coupled with the descriptions of potential actions that address the limiting factors and often specific species or life stage, provide a clear path for identifying and prioritizing projects, which is the next best thing to listing and prioritizing specific projects.

---

[4] In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies and prioritizes specific actions and geographic areas for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

4. Community issues

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify community issues and concerns regarding salmon habitat protection and restoration?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for salmon protection and restoration efforts? For the highest biological priority actions and areas?
- Does the strategy prioritize these actions?
- Does the strategy articulate what community values will be taken into consideration in evaluating and ranking projects?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?
- Does the strategy provide for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists?

Rating: ____Excellent[5]   __X__Good   ____Fair   ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The connection to community interests is not fully clear in the ranking criteria.

The strategy includes goals and some actions to build community support, and it recognizes that some projects that are not the top biological priorities might have added value because of the role they have in building community support.

Some community values that may affect prioritization are included.

Fit of the Project List to the Strategy

5. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:
- The extent the project list addresses the highest priority action and areas, and
- The extent that those actions and areas benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed processes, and limiting habitat features.

Rating: ____Excellent[6]   ____Good   __X__Fair   ____Poor

---

[5] The strategy provides for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists; proposes specific actions for building or maintaining community support for highest biological priority actions and areas; lists community values that will be taken into consideration in project evaluation and ranking; and the project evaluation criteria reflect these priorities and values.

[6] The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Two of five projects are not in the highest priority area.

The strategy gives primary emphasis to protection and restoration.

The first project on the list is clearly consistent with the strategy, as it acquires a high priority area. The remaining four projects however, are feasibility studies that are intended to lead to projects that restore habitat elements such as culvert blockages, logjams, and rip-rap. However, it appears that these four projects will lead primarily to rehabilitation projects.

The strategy calls for assessment work prior to initiating such habitat restoration projects, but it makes this a lower priority than projects to restore watershed processes. One of them is in a top priority area, and one of them discusses possible habitat forming processes projects.

---

6. Fit of project <u>ranking</u>

The Review Panel will consider the extent the rank <u>order</u> of the project list addresses the highest priority:
- Stocks
- Limiting watershed processes
- Limiting habitat features
- Actions
- Geographic areas
- Community interests

Rating: __X__**Excellent**[7]   ____Good   ____Fair   ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Rank order is consistent with strategy.

Projects that are most inconsistent with the strategy are at the bottom of the list.

The projects appear to be in the rank order that would be most consistent with the strategy, with the only on-the-ground project being an acquisition in a top priority area.

The studies appear to be ranked consistent with priority species and areas.

---

[7] The rank <u>order</u> of the entire list of projects fits the priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest priorities identified in the strategy and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy, they are lower in the list.

Summary Narrative:

In general, the focus and specificity of the strategy are very good, whereas the fit of the list is fairly good.

The rank order of the list is consistent with the level of specificity in the strategy (an excellent fit to a fairly well focused strategy).

SRFB 5th Round Review Panel Ratings and Narratives

Lead Entity: **Yakima River Basin Salmon Recovery Board**

Specificity and Focus of Strategy
1. Species and stocks[1]
The Review Panel will consider: • Does the strategy clearly identify all of the stocks in the WRIA(s) comprising the lead entity area?   • Is the status of each stock presented?   • Are one or more stocks prioritized for habitat restoration and/or protection actions?   • Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?   • Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?
Rating: __**X**__**Excellent**[2]　　____Good　　____Fair　　____Poor
Narrative (rationale for rating):   *The species and their listing status are clearly presented in the strategy, and they are clearly prioritized with very clear rationale –* **among the clearest presentations of species/stock priorities**.   *The project ranking criteria clearly give more points to projects that benefit the priority species.*
2. Habitat features and watershed processes
The Review Panel will consider: • Does the strategy clearly identify watershed processes (i.e., habitat forming processes) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?   • Does the strategy clearly identify habitat features (i.e., habitat conditions) that are limiting factors for prioritized stocks?   • Does the strategy prioritize limiting watershed processes?   • Does the strategy prioritize limiting habitat features?   • Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?   • Do the project ranking criteria reflect the above priorities?
Rating: 　____Excellent[3]　　__**X**__**Good**　　____Fair　　____Poor

---

[1] See *A Guide to Lead Entity Strategy Development*, October 10, 2003, for details.

[2] The strategy clearly identifies all salmonid species stocks in the lead entity area, and the status of each stock; one or more stocks are prioritized; there is a clear and supportable rationale presented to justify the priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

[3] The strategy clearly identifies limiting habitat features and watershed processes and prioritizes these habitat features and watershed processes for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the lead entity's ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The strategy uses an EDT-based approach to identification of habitat features that is comprehensive and well delivered, but watershed processes and their linkages to habitat features are not clearly articulated.

The strategy identifies limiting factors for reaches, and the focus is more on habitat conditions and ecological functions than it is on habitat forming processes. The strategy lists up to five limiting factors for each reach based on EDT analysis. That list includes some watershed processes as well as some habitat features.

The linkages to the project evaluation questions are not fully clear.

---

3. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify specific actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed processes?
- Does the strategy prioritize actions for restoration and/or protection of targeted habitat features and watershed processes?
- Does the strategy identify specific geographic areas associated with prioritized actions?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities?

Rating: ____Excellent[4]   __X__Good   ____Fair   ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The strategy identifies and prioritizes general limiting factors, but not specifically with regard to actions and areas (i.e., actions for reaches are not listed).

The strategy describes the limiting factors and presents a set of questions that can help sponsors and evaluators determine whether a project addresses them, but it does not go so far as to identify specific actions that could be taken.

Geographic areas are prioritized and the associated limiting factors are identified, but not specific actions.

---

[4] In an excellent strategy: The strategy clearly identifies and prioritizes specific actions and geographic areas for the benefit of priority species and stocks; there is a clear and supportable rationale for these priorities; and the project ranking criteria reflect these priorities.

4. Community issues

The Review Panel will consider:
- Does the strategy clearly identify community issues and concerns regarding salmon habitat protection and restoration?
- Does the strategy propose specific actions for building or maintaining community support for salmon protection and restoration efforts? For the highest biological priority actions and areas?
- Does the strategy prioritize these actions?
- Does the strategy articulate what community values will be taken into consideration in evaluating and ranking projects?
- Is there a clear and supportable rationale for establishing these priorities?
- Do the project ranking criteria reflect the priorities?
- Does the strategy provide for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists?

Rating: ____Excellent[5]   ____Good   ____Fair   __X__Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

Community issues are not clearly addressed in the strategy and an outreach element is not evident; however, in the presentation the intent to bolster this in next strategy was expressed to the RP.

Community values are addressed in the strategy in a diffuse manner that is difficult to discern.

The strategy lists a goal to increase community involvement and an objective to educate the community, and the project evaluation includes an evaluation of whether the project has community support and partners. However, the strategy does not clearly identify community issues, and the summary simply says that all the biologically based high priority projects have community support.

Actions are not identified to strategically build and maintain community support for priority biological needs.

Ranking criteria do not address community issues other than through CAG participation in the process.

Fit of the Project List to the Strategy

5. Actions and geographic areas

The Review Panel will consider:
- The extent the project list addresses the highest priority action and areas, and
- The extent that those actions and areas benefit the highest priority stocks, limiting watershed processes, and limiting habitat features.

Rating: ____Excellent[6]   ____Good   __X__Fair   ____Poor

---

[5] The strategy provides for an effective process for evaluating and weighing community values and taking these values into consideration when developing and prioritizing project lists; proposes specific actions for building or maintaining community support for highest biological priority actions and areas; lists community values that will be taken into consideration in project evaluation and ranking; and the project evaluation criteria reflect these priorities and values.

[6] The entire project list addresses the highest priority actions and areas, benefiting the highest priority stocks and the highest priority habitat features and watershed processes.

Narrative (rationale for rating):

This is the longest project list reviewed, which contains a very diverse array of projects.

All projects on the list do not address highest priorities.

The first half of the project list addresses priority species with actions that the TAG determined were priority actions based on their evaluation method.

The TAG judged projects in the second half to not be priority actions or not addressing priority species.

Reflecting the local strategy and process, these projects should probably not be funded until all the top priority actions have been completed.

[NOTE: At the 11/3 presentation to RP, the lead entity expressed an interest in reducing the length of their list (i.e., eliminating the bottom half) and submitting supportive information to the RP for evaluation. This might have lead to an increase in this rating and corresponding changes to the narrative. However, the RP received no further information for evaluation.]

6. Fit of project *ranking*

The Review Panel will consider the extent the rank <u>order</u> of the project list addresses the highest priority:
- Stocks
- Limiting watershed processes
- Limiting habitat features
- Actions
- Geographic areas
- Community interests

Rating: __X__**Excellent**[7]   ____Good   ____Fair   ____Poor

Narrative (rationale for rating):

The rank order of the list appears to be consistent with the priorities in the strategy.

Since the strategy does not identify specific actions or watershed processes in a priority sequence, this is as good as can be done until the strategy is refined.

The strategy gives preference to habitat protection over restoration, and this is reflected in the order of the list.

Summary Narrative:

In general, the focus and specificity of the strategy are good (with the exception of community interests), and the fit of the list is fair.

---

[7] The rank <u>order</u> of the entire list of projects fits the priorities (stocks, habitat features, watershed processes, actions, geographic areas, community issues) presented in the strategy. That is, the highest ranked projects fit the highest priorities identified in the strategy and, if there are projects that address lower priorities in the strategy, they are lower in the list.